

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1903.

ARTICLE I.

DE RITIBUS ECCLESIASTICIS.

THE FIFTEENTH ARTICLE OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.*

By LUTHER KUHLMAN, D.D.

Adhering to a custom, which, so far as I am aware, has not been departed from, that of treating the articles of the Confession in order, we come at this time to the XVth. In the Book of Concord, by Dr. H. E. Jacobs, this Article reads as follows :

"Concerning Ecclesiastical Rites, they teach, that those rites are to be observed, which may be observed without sin, and are profitable for tranquility and good order in the Church ; such as are set holidays, feasts and such like. Yet concerning such things, men are to be admonished, that consciences are not to be burdened as if such service were necessary to salvation."

"They are also to be admonished that human traditions, instituted to propitiate God, to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are opposed to the Gospel and the doctrine of faith. Wherefore vows and traditions, instituted to merit grace and make satisfaction for sins, are useless and contrary to the Gospel."

Our Article, then, treats of what are known as the Adia-

* Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 27th, 1903.

phora, that is, things indifferent, which are neither enjoined nor prohibited by the word of God, but are the result of man's mental and spiritual activities, influenced by the exigencies of time and place, and guided by the truth and Spirit of God. It has to do with externalities. The great evangelical truths which were primarily in controversy in that memorable religious struggle of the Sixteenth Century, which affected the whole course of history, and whose results will continue to bless the world down to the end of time, these truths it indeed touches, but in form only incidentally, as they are involved in, and affected by, the *Adiaphora*. For the treatment of so large a subject, and one that reaches out in so many directions, the Article is a brief one, and general. The material it presents may be thus summarized: It allows that there are *Adiaphora*; enjoins their observance; and in a brief, yet careful and well considered manner, in a moderate, conciliatory spirit, calls attention to some of the chief considerations which are to guide the Church in matters pertaining to the forms and accessories of worship, statements of faith, Church government and organization.

This being the character of the Article, the question might occur, is it then entitled to a place among the doctrinal articles of the chief Lutheran Confession, and so stamped as a fundamental tenet of the faith? Is it worthy to be included in the same category with such articles as those on God, Original Sin, the Son of God, the Church, the Sacraments, and Justification by Faith? To this query we unhesitatingly reply in the affirmative. It is a fitting companion to the articles we have named. These articles present elemental, constitutive truths. Apart from the apprehension and believing acceptance of these truths there can be no saved relation of the individual to God, and hence no Christianity, no Church. "This is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent" (John 17 : 3). Defined as the act of the perceiving mind and the trusting spirit, enabled thereto by grace, this knowledge of God in Christ, is synonymous with life, *it is eternal life*. But this renewed life of God in

the soul does not remain alone, and only within. According to its very nature it cannot do so. It seeks to create for itself a body. Under pressure of a necessity similar to that which impels the principle of vegetable life to clothe itself in innumerable forms of beauty and use, does this spiritual life seek manifestation and form. Thus, according to a divine order and process the visible Church, with all that pertains thereto, comes into existence. The one Church is viewed under two aspects, the visible, and the invisible. A correct understanding of the Church must include both aspects. Hence it is that the Article which treats of those features which pertain to the external Church may not be neglected.

The importance of the subject matter of the Article, in the view of the confessors, is further attested by the place which it occupies in the symbols and writings of that early period. The carefully prepared statements setting forth the position of the reformers are made to cover "all the articles, both of faith and of external Church usages and ceremonies," that were matters of complaint. In that presented at Torgau they say that "The discussion now is especially concerning some abuses which have been introduced by human doctrine and practices." The first topic treated is, "The Doctrines and Ordinances of Men," and the document itself, as is well known, became the basis for the Second, and much the longer part, of the Augustana. It is the view of Dr. Jacobs that this part dealing with abuses "was the main object in the minds of the Confessors, the doctrinal part being merely introductory." The unhappy and bitter controversies which followed the death of Luther, which estranged some who had been true yoke fellows in the cause of Christ and his truth, inflicted wounds that would not heal, and may be said to have imperiled the precious results which had been won at so great sacrifice in the contest with the papacy, were waged largely about these same matters. As in the case of the Lord's Supper, so here. These very debates and controversies are impressive proof of the importance of the questions at issue. Frank says, "It is not easy to find another Article whose shaping and recognition has encountered less

difficulties." True, religious controversialists are sometimes guilty of wasting precious time and making a great deal of unnecessary noise in the so-called discussion of veritable trifles, as when, a few years ago an ecclesiastical body seriously deliberated the question whether or not it was allowable for a man to wear a necktie. Graver issues were in controversy in the formation of this Article.

One other thought will serve to exhibit what may be regarded as the unique importance of our theme. It is strenuously insisted upon in some quarters that in the study of the Confession we must not rest until we arrive at the "true, native and original sense" of the same. As we are considering a historic document, it might not be easy to say why this is not a just rule, though in this case it would not necessarily follow that we must adhere exclusively to this "sense." If the rule is just, then it imposes upon us the duty to think ourselves back into the position of the confessors, see things as they saw them, and study them with the emphasis with which they studied them. Viewing the Article from this standpoint, we are impressed with the fact, that they had their eye not so much upon the *Adiaphora*, as upon the great truths which were inseparably interwoven with them. The structure of the Article exhibits this. "Yes," they say, "we approve of ecclesiastical rites; they are quite important, and they are to be observed, but it is essential that they be not unduly magnified, so as to burden conscience, and obscure precious truth." It is a case in which the provisos outweigh the rule itself. In framing the Article as they did they were guarding the center of their position, the sinner's justification by faith. The papists were saying, "Do this, observe that ceremony, and thou shalt be justified." To this spiritual cancer which pervaded the whole religious teaching, worship and life of their day, the reformers were ever presenting the evangelical antidote.

Having thus stated the scope of the Article, and called attention to the emphasis which it gives to certain truths, we may proceed to the consideration of the object or purpose of these human ordinances, which is, to aid the Church in attain-

ing her ideal, and to enable her to accomplish that task in the world which her Lord has appointed her. The ideal is nothing less or other, than holiness, the sanctification, individually and collectively, of the entire household of faith. "But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption" (1 Cor 1 : 30). "For this is the will of God, even your sanctification" (1 Thess. 4 : 3). In his sacerdotal prayer our Lord includes this petition, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth" (John 17 : 17). This, according to St. Paul, is the object Christ had in view when he honored and blessed the Church with his love and gave himself for it, "that he might sanctify it and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish" (Eph. 5 : 26-27). The sanctification which Christ cherished for his Church is not a partial one. Though not attained in this present order, yet the goal is completeness.

Parallel with this is the fact of the mission of the Church to the world, its evangelization. There is in the Bible a note of universalism. "In him," that is in Abraham, "shall all the nations of the earth be blessed" (Gen. 18 : 18). The family of God has been widely dispersed over the earth. In the passing of the centuries deep modifications have been effected in the scattered portions of that family, so that they scarce recognize each other as brethren. The divine Father, however, owns and blesses them all. His election is as wide as his love. The fore-announcements of the coming of the Messiah inform us, that "all nations shall call him blessed, the whole earth shall be filled with his glory; the gentiles shall come to his light, and kings to the brightness of his rising." The advent anthem is, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." Mark you, not peace in Jerusalem or Palestine, but on earth. Speaking of his cross, on which he would accomplish the world's redemption, Christ said, "And I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me." His prayer, already

referred to, sounds the same note again and again. So when Christ, prior to his ascension, compressed this truth into one brief, authoritative command, he could not, without ringing false to the whole tenor of revelation, make it less broad than he did, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations." To this commission he attaches the promise of his perpetual presence. And it is not without interest to note that Pentecost witnessed a literal fulfillment of the commission. The Spirit-filled Apostles delivered their message not merely to the Jews, but devout men out of every nation were present, "and they heard every man in his own tongue, the wonderful works of God." This, my brethren, is the divinely appointed, two-fold work of the Church. For this she has been made the repository of the Word and the Sacraments; for this the Holy Spirit abides with her, to instruct, guide and inspire her; and for this, as the practical human agency for the teaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, she institutes these human ordinances. Their suitability as instrumentalities for this end is not only the measure of their importance, but of their very right to exist. The whole aim of the Article is to rescue these *Adiaphora*, one and all, from their perverted use of burdening consciences, destroying souls, and dishonoring Christ, and to restore them to serviceableness in the work of the Church. It is this object that imparts to our subject an intensely practical aspect.

Their purpose clearly before us, we note now the provisos which the confessors were constrained to insert.

The first of these is the doctrine of justification by faith. As already suggested, the Article bears on its face the evidence that it was the chief concern of the confessors that this precious truth might not be set in any uncertain light. It must be made to stand out clearly and distinctly. Two and a half brief lines suffice for them to say that ecclesiastical rites are to be observed, to define them, and to cite illustrations. Throughout the remainder of the Article follow the cautions, reiterated over and over: "Consciences must not be burdened as though such observances were necessary to salvation;

human traditions instituted to propitiate God, to merit his favor, to make satisfaction for sins, are contrary to the gospel and to the doctrine of faith." Clearly, with existing forms as such, they had no quarrel. As we shall note later, they cheerfully observed them. Nor is it too much to say, humanly speaking, that if their opponents had consented to the elimination of the perversions and falsifications which infected the whole system of the *Adiaphora*, and had in good faith assented to the evangelical view, the course of ecclesiastical history since then would have been vastly different than it is.

That the sacred interest of truth justified and necessitated these repeated precautions, may be readily set forth. In no other way could they disentangle error from truth, and clearly define their position as essentially and fundamentally different from that of their opponents. That this asserted difference was real and not fanciful, that they were not guarding against imaginary evils, may be learned from the statements of the Romanists themselves. In their *Confutation*, prepared by "learned, judicious and amiable men, for the purpose of approving what they regarded true, and refuting the rest from Scripture," the statement made in the first part of our article, namely, that certain rites which they describe "ought to be observed," is accepted. Here both parties stand on common ground. When, however, the *Confession* goes on to say that traditions instituted to propitiate God, etc., are contrary to the gospel and the doctrine of faith, then the note of dissent is heard. "The appendix to this Article," says the *Confutation*, "must be entirely removed," for its assertion is false. "Most false also is the declaration that the righteousness of faith is obscured by such ordinances," and in extolling faith above all things, they assert, "St. Paul is antagonized."

Out of their own mouth, therefore, we have the position of the Romanists, and this might suffice. The discussion of Plitt, however, in his *Einleitung*, on this point is so clear and instructive that we give it at some length. He not only states the position of the Romanists, but also indicates the line of plausible reasoning by which it is naturally reached. Plitt

says: "To Church government belongs, according to the Romish conception, also the authority to make regulations and to issue laws whose observance was not only beneficial for the salvation of souls, but even necessary. By this means large opportunity was given for the exercise of sacerdotal caprice and arbitrariness. Christ, it is properly observed, has taught that which is absolutely necessary to salvation; that which is helpful and beneficial thereto he has committed to the Holy Ghost. He, that is, Christ, did not himself, establish everything. Christians, during the sojourn of the Lord upon the earth, were not yet able to bear all things. For this reason much that was profitable to them was kept back, in order that at the fitting time the Church, in his name, might teach this order, and establish it. For this reason he invested her with great authority, and gave to her the Holy Spirit, who guides her into all truth, so that she cannot err. Because of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit it is also her prerogative to interpret the Scriptures, and to determine the correct understanding of the same. And, for this reason, her own enactments, are always in accord with the Scripture; they are merely a continuation, a completion, an elucidation, of the latter. Those things, therefore, which the Church, in the march of the centuries, has taught and decreed as useful for the life of believers and the salvation of their souls, these they should so regard, and in sincere obedience order their lives accordingly. The observance of these enactments of the Church secures for them as great advantage as does the observance of the immediate commandments of God himself, whilst disobedience and contempt of them are accounted to them as sins, and as casting their souls into ruin. What the commandments of the Church are, where they are to be sought for, there can be no doubt; for the Church is represented by the priests, and exercises control or government, through the bishops, especially through the councils and through the Pope. The Church is the Romish Church. What she enjoins, this, all Christians, by the salvation of their souls, are obliged to observe.

"Ecclesiastical ordinances aim at the salvation of souls;

through intentional disregard of the same, Christians forfeit eternal life. This was constantly asserted by those who maintained the necessity of these ordinances. They were, therefore, nothing other than a means of salvation, and their fulfillment, good works, in which Christians were directed to repose confidence. And this they did."

Here then are the teachings with which the reformers joined issue. We do not wonder that their confessional statement was constructed with the utmost care. Properly understood they might assent to the view of their opponents, that, "ecclesiastical rites aim at the salvation of souls," that they are "profitable," and so forth. When, however, it was insisted that in the enactment of ordinances the Church, that is, the Roman hierarchy, could not fall into any error, that these ordinances were necessary to salvation; that their observance secures as great advantage as does the observance of the immediate commandments of God, that Christians must repose confidence in them, and that disregard of the same forfeits eternal life, then they came to the parting of the ways. Such views were indeed contrary to the doctrine of faith, as they had learned it. Against this subtle and all pervasive error they could not bear their testimony too often or too emphatically. Human traditions, however ancient and venerable, however splendid and impressive, however august the authority with which they are promulgated, do not make satisfaction for sin. Abstinence from meats, the observance of days, the assumption of vows, ritualistic performances, and servile submission to hierarchical authority, these do not propitiate God, nor remove the guilt of the soul. Standing in the synagogue in Antioch in Pisidia, St. Paul said: "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts 13 : 38-39). To the Romans he writes: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (Romans 3 : 20). And again, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus

Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified" (Gal. 2 : 16). "But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident: for, the just shall live by faith" (Gal. 3 : 11). Even the law given by God through Moses could not compass human salvation. Obedience to law resulted in the knowledge of sin, and the intensification of the sense of guilt. Should men then seek or hope to find, in conformity to human ordinances, that which the divine law failed to secure? No. "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God," was the legend emblazoned on their banner. This was the beacon which guided their feet in every devious, perplexing way of discussion, this the watchword that inspired their faith and courage in the mighty conflict. "That one truth, justification by faith without works of any character, was the impelling power of the Reformation, removed the oppressive yoke of legalism under which the Romish Church had placed her people, and restored again salutary Church ordinances, and good, historic practices."

Nor has the Church, in our day, in her understanding and use of the *Adiaphora*, passed wholly beyond the need of similar cautions. Amid the changes of the passing centuries, the tendencies of human nature remain essentially the same. So-called new errors, upon more careful examination, are usually found to be the old ones under a different form. The roots of legalism are deeply imbedded in the human heart. They are not easily destroyed. "What shall I do to be saved?" "Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" (Micah 6 : 6-7). These questions still echo in human hearts. To stand before God in abject weakness, in absolute poverty, to have nothing to offer, and to

receive forgiveness, peace with God, and everlasting life, as the undeserved gift of divine grace and love, this the natural man does not readily assent to. To substitute connection with the merely visible Church, participation in its work, observance of its forms, for simple trust in Christ, this is a temptation in which men are easily ensnared. The *Adiaphora*, then, must not be permitted to throw a shadow upon the cross of Christ. They must not usurp the place of faith.

A second proviso to be noted, is the relation of these human institutions to the word of God. This relation is one of origin and harmony. They must be truly Scriptural. It is not meant of course, that they can be bodily drawn from the Scriptures. The Bible does not furnish ready-prepared formularies for worship, creeds, and systems of Church government. It does this less now, than it did in the past. For the people of God in their infancy the Old Testament did supply explicit and full directions with reference to many of these matters. Whole books are practical directories. Even the tabernacle, the place of their worship, was to be constructed and arranged in all its appointments in accordance with a model divinely exhibited to Moses. In the carefully prescribed social, civil and religious institutions of the old dispensation, God's people received an invaluable training and discipline, and when the time came for their freer development under the direction of the Spirit and providence of God in the new dispensation, they drew from them many suggestions. Yet, as we pass into the new, there is evident a marked change, an emancipation from a system of rules and directories. We are conscious of a different atmosphere.

And yet the present connection between ordinances and the word is not any the less real and vital than it was then. It is, if possible, more so, and the very fact that the relation is freer and more flexible, less of the letter and more of the spirit, devolves upon the Church the greater responsibility to see to it that this relation shall be kept inviolate. The power of the Church is in the Word, and to divorce her institutions from it is to palsify them. The Word is the norm, and the effectiveness

of ordinances of every kind depends upon the preservation of this living attachment. The branch that is detached from the vine has no life in it, and consequently bears no fruit. Similarly, ecclesiastical equipment, apart from the truth, spirit and power of the word, so far as the high ends of the gospel are concerned, is a useless, human mechanism.

This connection is clearly recognized, for example, in the General Synod's subscription of the Augsburg Confession. "All regularly constituted Lutheran Synods connected with the General Synod, receive and hold, with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, the Word of God, as contained in the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as the only infallible rule of faith and practice, and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word." We cannot fail to note here the preëminence of the Word, and the relation of the Confession thereto. The Word is the truth, the Confession is the form it took at a particular time and under given circumstances, in the apprehension of men. The Word is the "infallible rule of faith and practice," while the Confession is a "correct exhibition of the doctrine of the Word." The Confession in its form is human, and hence subject to modification in the light of the clearer understanding of the Word; the Word, in substance and form, abides the same, except as the latter has been corrupted in the handling by fallible men. The whole document as a creedal expression is derived from and rests upon the Word. Its consistency with the word, is the measure of its binding force upon us.

A reference to the subject of Church government discloses the same connection. So rapid was the growth of the Church and the consequent multiplication of duties resting upon the Apostles, that they were soon burdened beyond their strength. When the complaint of the Grecians, that their widows were neglected in the alms ministrations reached their ears, they called the multitude of the disciples and directed them to "select seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and of

faith, whom we may appoint over this business." This they did, and we have the establishment of the office of deacon, and the beginning of government and organization.

Wherever St. Paul and his fellow missionaries succeeded in planting the faith, there they ordained "Elders," in whose charge for teaching and oversight the infant congregations were placed. The Church of Corinth especially exhibited activity. "No Church excelled it in the variety of its endowments and the satisfaction felt in them. Hence it is in his letter to that congregation that Paul enumerates and discusses the chief Corinthian charismata." There are, he says, "diversities of gifts," "diversities of administrations," "diversities of workings." Under "ministrations he embraces all Church ministry, the various forms of official Christian service, whether performed by the minister or the laity." In 1 Cor. 12 : 28 he indicates two administrative functions in the Church, "helps" and "government." The first includes "the office of deacons and deaconesses, as in Acts 6 : 3, while the second refers to the office of presbyter, derived from the synagogue, and often designated in Apostolic times as that of the Episcopate, or bishops, in accommodation to the Greek and other Gentile Christians. As the diaconate was occupied with works of mercy, the presbyterate regulated the order and discipline of the Church." (Jacobs). The beginnings then of polity and organization grew out of the needs of the rapidly extending Church, and the record of these beginnings contains many hints, and suggestions, precepts and examples, which are valuable guides for all succeeding time. It is not necessary that every detail be witnessed to by a clear "thus saith the Lord," yet all must be in harmony with the spirit of the Word. The Formula of Government holds it as a preliminary principle that "order is necessary to every associate body, and as Jesus Christ has left no entire specific form of Government and Discipline for his Church, it is the duty of every individual church to adopt such regulations as appear to them most consistent with the spirit and precepts of the New Testament, and best calculated to subserve the interests of the Church of Christ."

In the worship formularies of the Church this relation to the Word is still more apparent. Luther's characteristically strong statements on this point are familiar, and yet it will not be amiss to record a few of them here again. "In all worship the greatest and principal thing is to preach and teach God's Word." "We must know first of all that the Christian congregation should never assemble except the Word of God be preached and prayer be offered, even though it be very short, as in Psalm 102. When the King and the people assemble to worship God, they should proclaim the name and praise of God." "In all the world nothing is more holy than the Word of God; for the Sacrament itself is made and blessed and bestowed through God's Word, and thereby all of us are spiritually born again and consecrated to be Christians." "Given and shed for you, for the remission of sins—these words of promise, together with the bodily eating and drinking, are the chief things in the sacrament, and he who believes these words, has what they declare, namely, the forgiveness of sins." "Christian worship," says Horn, "rests primarily on the person and work of Jesus Christ." This is in harmony with what Luther says when he asks, "What is this Word, and by what means is it used since there are so many words of God? I answer that the Apostle Paul (Romans 1) explains what it is, namely, the Gospel of God concerning His Son, incarnate, suffering, risen and glorified through the Spirit, the Sanctifier." Says another, "Liturgy is the form that doctrine takes for the purposes of worship. Worship formularies are based upon the fundamental doctrines and are conditioned by them. Liturgy is informed by the doctrine, and if it be pure and true, it must at every point be in harmony with its inner doctrinal and spiritual life. As the bloom and fruit of a tree are the expression of its inner life, so a pure and sufficient liturgy is the natural bloom and proper fruitage of the living doctrine from which it springs" (Geisinger). To point out the scriptural richness of accepted Lutheran forms would carry us far beyond the proper scope of this lecture.

Having thus noted these provisos which the confessors felt

constrained to place in our Article, we may now call attention to a few of the principles which, according to accepted Lutheran teaching, underlie and regulate the use of the *Adiaphora*.

Their value and importance are recognized, and their use commended. The Article plainly says, "they are to be observed." From what we know of the position of the reformers it would not be reading anything into their language to say, that observance of properly instituted ecclesiastical ceremonies and regulations, is required. Meritoriousness in justification is always disallowed the *Adiaphora*, but their serviceableness in the process of the development of the soul in righteousness, for the preservation of the truth, as an aid to its dissemination in the world and thereby the extension of the Redeemer's Kingdom, and as an instrumentality for worship, has ever been recognized. This serviceableness rests on the fact that to all that God designs to accomplish in man, that is, his sanctification, and to all that he would achieve by him, the world's evangelization, man sustains a coöperative relation. Here he has something to do. Hollaz says, "The regenerate and justified man concurs in the work of his sanctification as a secondary cause, subordinate and moved by God, so that he renews himself daily by the powers which he has received from above. The Holy Spirit produces in man without human concurrence, the power to produce good works, and the first act of sanctification, but man concurs in the second act of sanctification, or in the exercise and continuance of it, when once introduced by the Holy Spirit. * * * The regenerate man coöperates with God in the work of sanctification, but not by an equal action, but in subordination and dependence on the Holy Spirit, because he does not work with native, but with granted powers."

The sculptor in releasing the angel imprisoned in the marble, works alone. From the first blow of the hammer to the last touch of the chisel, there is in the dead marble no will or power of either resistance or coöperation. The regenerated soul, however, has in it power of response to the wish and the effort of the Divine Artist. However feebly, it can and must

co-work with God in the perfecting of redemption. Luther in his "Christian Liberty," puts our thought thus: "Although as I have said, inwardly, and according to the spirit, a man is amply enough justified by faith, having all that he requires to have, except that this very faith and abundance ought to be increased from day to day, even till the future life; still he remains in this mortal life upon earth, in which it is necessary to rule his own body, and have intercourse with men. Here then works begin; here he must not take his ease; here he must give heed to exercise his body by fastings, watchings, labor, and other moderate discipline, so that it may be subdued to the spirit, and obey and conform itself to the inner man and faith, and not rebel against them, as is its nature to do if it is not kept under." Again he says, "Our doings, life, and being, in works and ceremonies, are done from the necessities of this life, and with the motive of governing our bodies; but yet we are not justified by these things, but by the faith of the Son of God." "We cannot live in this world without ceremonies and works." "We do not condemn works and ceremonies; nay, we set the highest value on them."

Fully persuaded of the utility of the *Adiaphora*, they proceeded in the work of reformation in accordance with this principle. They did not, for instance, cut loose from all confessional statements. The Apostles' Creed, The Nicenè Creed, and that of Athanasius, were accepted by them. Hutter (*B. of C.*, Vol. 11. p. 13) says, "Those symbols which have been approved by the unanimous consent of the whole Church (to which belong the oecumenical symbols) have far greater authority than those which have been received only by particular Churches."

In the Formula of Concord (*B. of C.*, Vol. 1, p. 535) we have this testimony: "And because, of old, the true Christian doctrine, in a pure, sound sense, was collected from God's Word into brief articles or sections against the corruption of heretics, we accept as confessional the three Oecumenical Creeds, as glorious confessions of the faith, brief, devout, and founded upon God's Word, wherein all these heresies which

had at that time arisen in the Christian Church are clearly and unanswerably refuted."

As furnishing an interesting sidelight upon this point, it may be of sufficient historic interest to deserve record here, that the congregation which I have the honor to serve as pastor, in 1747 made this confessional declaration: "That it worshiped God Almighty according to the Protestant Lutheran persuasion grounded in the Old and New Testament, and in the unaltered Augsburg Confession, and the rest of the Symbolical Book." It is a matter of further interest that this statement was prepared by Muhlenburg, and is in his handwriting.

This fidelity to approved doctrinal statements needs to be emphasized. Many are restive under creeds, and are eager to cast their bands from them. They regard them as interesting relics of the past, but not as possessing any value for the present. They are stigmatized as the enemies of intellectual freedom. The real motive for this depreciatory attitude is well stated by Plitt when he says: "Those who desire freedom in doctrine, in the sense ordinarily employed at the present day, place themselves thereby as lords over the Church. They speak much of Christian freedom, and just thereby they enslave, or attempt to enslave the Church. Under this liberal, fair-sounding expression, often the most arrogant ambition is concealed."

I cannot refrain from expressing the conviction that in the prospect of a period of doctrinal laxity and theological vagaries, it is the duty of the general bodies of the Lutheran Church in this land to make every honorable effort to reach a harmonious understanding and agreement in regard to the elemental beliefs of their common faith. There are minor matters upon which they will differ. These should be held at their true worth or rank, and not used as tests with which to expel each other from the one household. In the primary things the Lutheran hosts must see eye to eye, believe heart to heart, stand shoulder to shoulder. Intelligently, unitedly grounded upon the truth as it is in Christ, they will be in a position to render Protestant Christianity in this land a signal service. I am not hinting at

organic union. This will come, if ever, in God's own time. Further, I am persuaded that the unity, which many long for, would be more easily and rapidly reached, if the question of organic union could be wholly eliminated. The very suspicion that such union is sought, is a hinderance to unity. Such effort is particularly enjoined upon us of the General Synod. Our constitution says, "It shall apply all its powers, prayers, and means for the prevention of schisms among us, it shall be sedulously and incessantly regardful of the circumstances of the times, and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in general, in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interest of the Redeemer's Kingdom may not pass neglected and unavailing." True, this looks to unity among Christians in general, but it must be apparent also that the most practical way to this general end, is by reaching an understanding in our own denominational household.

A similar course was pursued in regard to the established forms and usages of worship. The charge of their opponents "that all the ceremonies, all the things instituted of old are abolished in our churches," they resent as a calumnious falsehood, "and assert that in large part the ancient rites are diligently observed." "Though dissimilar rites instituted by men do not destroy the unity of the church, yet, for the sake of tranquillity it is pleasing to us that universal rites be observed. In the churches we willingly observe the order of the Mass, the Lord's Day, and other more eminent festival days. And with a very grateful mind, we embrace the profitable and ancient ordinances, especially since they contain a discipline, by which it is profitable to educate and instruct the people and those who are ignorant."

In his *Formula Missae* (1523) Luther affirms "that it is not and never has been our intention entirely to abolish all divine worship, but to purify that now in use, though defiled by the most abominable additions, and to indicate its pious use." With what zeal and in what spirit Luther endeavored to bring about this renovation of worship, may be learned from his four

liturgical writings, The Letter to the Chapter of all Saints Church at Wittenburg, The Order of Divine Service in the Congregation, The Formula Missae, and the German Mass, (1526). Here he traces the origin and growth of what he denominates "The Ancient Service," passes under review the parts not merely of the chief service for the Lord's Day, but the minor services and those for the days of the week as well, indicating which are to be retained and which rejected, together with the exposition of the principles which guide him. It is matter for congratulation that these valuable writings have been given to the Church in excellent English dress in "Christian Worship, Its Principles and Forms," the joint work of Prof. Richard of this Seminary and Prof. Painter of Roanoke College.

The Lutheran Church then, at her beginning, throughout her history, and practically wherever she exists, is in worship a liturgical Church. She appreciates the propriety and worth of proper forms.

Again. No particular form, usage or custom, whether pertaining to worship, polity or organization, is to be regarded as essential. The word "essential" is employed here to designate that which is indispensable, absolutely requisite to the integrity or completeness of that of which it forms a part.

This principle is particularly in evidence in the sphere of worship formularies. Luther prepared the first ones, and others followed him in the same line. These earlier forms became models and guides, until every state, every city well nigh, published its own form of service. These numerous forms and their variations naturally gave rise to the question as to which of these orders are to be regarded as presenting more correctly the Lutheran ideas of worship. What a world of trouble Luther would have saved some of his followers if when he gave out his forms, he had inserted a rubric to this effect, "These forms are Evangelical in teaching, they are suitable and profitable for worship, let them be used without deviation."

Liturgical scholars usually include these forms under three

general types. Funk, in his *Kirchen ordnung*, specifies and comments on these types thus:

1. "Those in which, indeed, the Evangelical doctrine is recognized and its distinct proclamation determined, but in which church regulations in closest agreement with the Papistical were retained. These have set up proper ideas about evangelical Church regulations, but did not carry them out.

2. Those in which the practical directions of Luther were followed. This is especially the case with the liturgies into which his order of worship of 1526 and his other forms were either incorporated, or if perchance, there were cases leaning to the Papal ritual, yet, they were used as a basis.

3. Those in which the Church matters began to be arranged in close accord with the principles of the New Testament, and in which, therefore, Luther's directions were, indeed, regarded or or used as types, but upon which Church matters were not exclusively founded.

Horn, in his *Liturgics*, states the division thus:

1. "Those which, while pure in doctrine, proceeded with greatest conservatism with reference to the traditional forms.

2. The Saxon-Lutheran type, represented by the *Formula Missae*.

3. Those orders which are more radical in their re arrangement of service and try to take a mediating position between the Lutheran and the Reformed types."

Gerhard, speaking of Baptism, says: "There are in general, three substantial parts of baptism to be maintained, which cannot be separated or changed, viz., water, the Word, and the action." To this act as thus described, there is usually added a series of ceremonies and usages, such as, "the declaration of original sin, the giving of the name, the minor exorcism, the sign of the cross, prayers, the imposition of hands, etc." of which he says, "We must not assert that such rites belong to the integrity and essence of baptism, and are necessary, but they are regarded as *Adiaphora*."

That in the effort to set forth the historic, normative Lutheran form, supposed to be imbedded in these almost numberless

approved orders which originated in the Reformation, men should differ, is not to be wondered at. Here the advice of St. Paul is in place, "Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." Every candid and intelligent student is fairly entitled to an independent view. But let him see to it that he hold it in sweetness and charity, without either contempt or censorious judgment of those who may not agree with him. Let him not elevate his own view into a test of the Lutheranism of his brethren. Such a course offends against the sacred right of Christian freedom. "The very life principle of Lutheranism requires that what is purely accidental, and in no way affects the doctrine, be not raised to the standard of the essential. If this be done the essentials will be degraded to the level of the accidental."

If the *Adiaphora* are non essential, then also must the principle of modification, adaptation, be admitted. Under given circumstances it may even be proper to wholly displace existing forms.

Note this principle as embodied in the teaching and action of Christ. He came at once to fulfill, and in the fulfillment, to repeal. The entire Old Testament foreshadowed him, and when he appeared its mission, in this particular, was ended. He came to make all things new, and this new creation would proceed from within. "I am come that they might have life," is his own explanation. This life will create its own body. The heavenly water will cut its own channel, shape its own course. The new vine will put forth its own leaves, flowers, and fruit. It was this in fact that brought him into conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities of his time. It was this that clouded the expectations of the followers of the Baptist, and called forth their complaint, "Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not," "If you are a teacher come from God, why does your teaching result in leading your followers away from the old established forms and customs, confirmed by the example of our own teacher, John." The change from the one to the other was so radical that they could not understand it. The reply of our Lord not only answers these per-

plexed questioners, but enunciates principles that will rule all similar questions to all ages. Hear him: "No man putteth a piece of new cloth into an old garment, for that which is put in to fill it up taketh from the garment, and the rent is made worse. Neither do men put new wine into old bottles; or else the bottles break and the wine runneth out, and the bottles perish; but they put new wine into new bottles, and both are preserved." Edersheim explains the meaning of these two parabolic illustrations thus: "You ask, why do we fast often, but thy disciples fast not? You are mistaken in supposing that the old garment can be retained, and merely its rents made good by patching it with a piece of new cloth. Not to speak of the incongruity, the effect would only be to make the rent ultimately worse. The old garment will not bear mending with the undressed cloth. * * * Or, again, take the other view of it, as the old garment cannot be patched from the new, so, on the other hand, can the new wine of the Kingdom not be confined in the old forms. It would burst these wine skins. The spirit must indeed have its corresponding forms of expression; but that form must be adapted, and correspond to it. Not the old with a little of the new to hold it together where it is rent; but the new, and that not in the old wine skins, but in a form corresponding to the substance. Such are the two final principles—the one primarily addressed to the Pharisees, the other to the disciples of John, by which the illustrative teaching concerning the marriage feast, with its bridal garment and wine of banquet, is carried far beyond the original question of the disciples of John, and receives application to all time." The entire external organization of the Church is to be the development of her own inherent spirit and life, adapted to particular needs, and shaped by existing conditions. What Plitt says of the Confessions, applies still more widely. "As much as the fact should be emphasized that the Confessions originate under the guidance of the Divine Spirit, yet it must never be forgotten that, since they were composed by men, they must be imperfect, and therefore not only are capable of, but need, development and improvement."

This principle however, must not be applied recklessly. "The Church, in working her way into the future, has constantly to look back into the past, in order to sustain her living connection with it." There should be no breaking of historic continuity. The Church of the present should carefully conserve the results of past experience and labor. This applies particularly in the sphere of worship. Truly devotional forms are not made to order in a day. They are a growth springing out of the faith, love, and spiritual experience of souls gifted with a genius for these matters. Some of these forms can be traced to Apostolic times, and even then, they were only adaptations of what was already old. Their survival, amid so many and great changes, is the proof of their adequacy to voice the emotions of the soul. They are hallowed by association, and to disturb them would be little short of profanation. Sometime the Church will make, or, perhaps better, arrange another service. On the whole it will be better than what we have now, but will there be in it anything superior to the Kyrie, the Glorias, the Magnificat, The Apostles' Creed, and some of the Collects in which we now worship? Will the Church resting upon the atonement of Jesus Christ ever drop out of its form for the Lord's Supper, the Agnus Dei? Where will she find, or who will compose for her, a more fitting, tenderly beautiful closing hymn than Simeon's "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace?" Here it is well to follow the example of the reformers. What was in conflict with the Word of God, what obscured or falsified the gospel, this they unhesitatingly rejected. Beyond this they proceeded with caution. Through long use these ceremonies and usages had become a potent factor in the religious life of the people, and to change them unnecessarily could only result in confusion and dissatisfaction, and increase the difficulties of the work in which they were engaged. Chemnitz's rule that, "no doctrine that is new and at variance with all antiquity, should be received in the Church," has application here also.

The Church Year is so inseparably interwoven with Christian worship that it should receive at least passing notice. The

truth that underlies this adaptation of the natural year, is Christ. The conviction that he is the one source of spiritual life, light and power, lead the Church to arrange her year about him as its sun. His birth, his death, his resurrection, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit are its chief festivals. These divide it into periods, and impress upon the whole their distinctive character. As time went on, other festivals were added. "Martyrology suggested Saints' days, asceticism furnished the preparatory seasons of fasting, and now and then the settlement of a great doctrinal battle added a special day." Particular attention was given to the selection of Scripture passages suitable to the event of the day, and so resulted the Pericopes. This same care is observable in the arrangement of the introits and collects, so that the variable parts of the service for each Sunday or festival, preserve a thematic harmony, which in turn, has its appropriate place in the unity of the entire year.

This institution is not an innovation. It has long historic precedent. Heathenism had its sacred year. For his ancient people God prescribed one, and it is not improbable that both the Passover and Pentecost of Judaism were adaptations from the heathen cultus, renovated and filled with revealed truth, while in the Christian year they are appropriated again, and appear as Easter and Whitsunday.

To this established order, Christ conformed. He observed the religious festivals of his people. There is no reason to doubt that in his home synagogue he himself read the Haph-tarah for the day, taken from the prophecies of Isaiah, and that he made it the basis of his instruction, saying, "This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

The aim of the Church year is to secure the regular, systematic presentation of those fundamental facts and associated truths which are the substance of revelation, and the basis and nourishment of Christian faith, and life. In this it recognizes the pedagogic principle that we learn thoroughly, only by constant repetition. In approving the use of the established order of the Church Year it is not signified that it must be undeviatingly followed in every detail, nor that, as we have it, is per-

fect. It is meant, however, that it rests upon correct principles.

This imperfect review of some of the principles which underlie this Article may serve at least to stir our gratitude and to emphasize duty. In the view of the confessors the *Adiaphora*, standing alone, were of secondary importance. They subordinated them to the Word and to the doctrine of faith. Such is still the position of our Church. Neither rationalism nor higher criticism have disturbed her confidence in the Bible, as the revelation of God. This Book is the living source of her doctrine and of her ordinances, the one authoritative standard by which all are measured. She knows and teaches no other Redeemer than the Christ of the gospels; points to no way of salvation except that of St. Paul, "By grace are ye saved, through faith." She not only continues to be satisfied with the Augustana, but accepts it with increasing intelligence, heartiness and enthusiasm. In her schools north and south, east and west, there is not a teacher, not a professor, under suspicion of disloyalty to the denominational standard. Luther's catechism is still the incomparable manual for the religious instruction of youth. The liturgists have fought their battle. The echoes of the strife are occasionally heard, but they are becoming fainter and fainter. Peace is coming, is here, on the only practical basis, that of Christian freedom and mutual respect. What remains then? This: Conscious of our direct connection with the greatest religious movement since the introduction of Christianity, and so with the Church of God in all ages; profoundly grateful for, and appreciative of the rich theological and liturgical treasures which are our inheritance, we need to remember that we live neither in the sixteenth century nor in the fatherlands beyond the sea, but in the twentieth century, and in free America, the queen in the sisterhood of nations, and the field of struggle for the supremacy of the religion of the old Book here, and the world over. Here and now is our mission. It is so indescribably great and urgent that to expend strength and energy in disproportionate discussion of non-essentials, is not only foolish, but positively wrong. To the ever increasing ful-

fillment of this mission, may the great Head of the Church graciously help us by his good Spirit.

In the preparation of the foregoing Lecture the following works have been consulted: *Book of Concord* by Jacobs, *Theologie Der Concordienformel* by Frank, *Einleitung in die Augstana* by Plitt, *Die Augsburgische Confession* by Zöckler, *Die Ehre und Lehre der Augsburgische Confession* by Weidner, *Populäre Symbolik* by Günther, *Christian Worship, Its Principles and Forms* by Richard and Painter, *Primary Works* by Luther, *Liturgies* by Horn, and the *Memoirs* of the Lutheran Liturgical Association.

ARTICLE II.

SOME PRESENT-DAY ASPECTS OF HIGHER CRITICISM.

By C. W. HEISLER, D.D.

The so called Higher Criticism is not altogether a modern science. The study of the books of the Bible with a view of determining their origin, date, literary structure and value does not belong wholly to the recent past, though perhaps it has not followed scientific methods until within comparatively recent times. Attempts were made to determine certain questions affecting the integrity of Old Testament books quite early in the history of Christianity. For our present purpose we may disregard these earlier attempts and confine ourselves to a brief historical survey of the modern period of Higher Criticism of the Scriptures.

This period dates from the middle of the eighteenth century. Jean Astruc, 1684-1766, a French physician of eminent learning but profligate life, may be regarded as the founder of the modern critical methods of Bible study. Astruc was led to conclude that Moses, in composing Genesis and part of Exodus, used at least two previously existing documents, in

one of which the divine name Jehovah (Lord) was exclusively employed, and in the other Elohim (God), while the subject matter of both largely paralleled. Eichhorn (1752-1827) extended the hypothesis to the other books of the Pentateuch and in addition pointed out differences of style in the alleged documents. He contended that the Pentateuch was compiled sometime between Joshua and Samuel, from documents written mostly during the age of Moses, and some by Moses himself. He claims that when these documents were put together they formed a continuous narrative, and differ from each other in diction, style, ideas, and aim. Eichhorn is the author of the "Higher Criticism." This is known as the Documentary Theory or Hypothesis. It will be observed that here the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, at least in the main, is not denied. Moses simply used two or more documents in compiling his histories. However some of the advocates of this theory came to regard much, if not most, of the Pentateuch as post-Mosaic.

The next step in higher critical study was the development of The Fragmentary Hypothesis, proposed by Rev. Alex. Gaddes (1737-1802), of Great Britain, and elaborated by Vater (1805) and Hartman (1831). Dr. Green calls this the Document Theory run mad. This hypothesis holds that the Pentateuch was composed, mostly in the reign of Solomon, of fragments of a large number of documents, some from the age of Moses, some from an earlier date. Instead of two or three documents pieced together section by section, the books of the Pentateuch are made up of bits and scraps from many sources, forming a literary mosaic. Vater held that Genesis alone was made up of fragments from 38 different sources. These two theories, the Documentary and the Fragmentary were developed by an application of the Literary Method of Criticism, that is, a comparison of the words, idioms, phrases and rhetorical style of the books. To De Wette (1780-1849) belongs the credit of first applying the historical argument in addition to the Literary, *i. e.*, using the historical data furnished by the books themselves. De Wette elaborated a the-

ory known as "*The Supplementary Hypothesis*." According to this there was a first document known as the Elohist, which formed the ground work, the kernel, the germ, the basis of the Pentateuch. A later writer, the Jehovist, took this, added to it, or supplemented it, by a history of his own, making such additions and supplying such omissions as were necessary to bring it into its present form. The Jehovist in his work probably used germane material from other documents. Deuteronomy, according to this, was composed in the reign of Josiah, 631 B. C.

The next theory of importance is "*The Crystalization Hypothesis*" of Ewald (1803-57). Ewald held that the nucleus of the Pentateuch consisted of the remnants of four primitive treatises which are imbedded in the various strata of the books. According to him the Pentateuch was made up of eight sources. (1) Book of the wars of Jehovah, *i. e.*, the military exploits of Moses and Joshua, composed soon after Joshua's death. (2) The Biography of Moses, written within a century after the death of Joshua. (3) The book of the Covenants from the period of Samson. (4) The Book of Origins, including the Levitical legislation, composed in Solomon's time. (5) The whole, thus far, enlarged by a Third Narrator, appearing in North Palestine, soon after the Book of Origins. (6) The Fourth Narrator, belonging to Southern Palestine, in the 9th century B. C. (7) The Fifth Narrator, belonging to Southern Palestine in the 8th century B. C. (8) The Deuteronomist, about 650 B. C., about 30 years before Hilkiah's discovery of the Book of the Law, in Josiah's reign. You will observe that according to Ewald, who was very dogmatic and arrogant in his assumptions, the Elohist was first and Deuteronomy was last in order. Ewald insisted on the unity of the Pentateuch. Each Narrator impressed a literary unity upon his work. These points are important.

The next important step was the development of "*A Modified Document Hypothesis*." This in fact worked a revolution in the critical world. It overturned the theories of Ewald and earlier critics, in large measure. The names of Hupfeld

(1853), Graf (1866), Kuenen (1865) and Wellhausen (1878 and 1889), are most prominently identified with this theory. Hupfeld undertook to show that the Jehovist document was an independent narrative; that the Elohist document, of the Documentary Hypothesis, was in reality not one but two documents, which he called the First Elohist and the Second Elohist. These three, the Jehovist, the First and Second Elohist, were fused into one by a nameless redactor, who is responsible for all the difficulties and troublesome passages.

Graf added to this his development theory, which was an application of the scientific theory of evolution in criticism. According to Graf Deuteronomy was written before the ritual law or Priests' Code of Leviticus and Numbers. The Ritual Law was begun by Ezekiel and completed in the time of Ezra, 445 B. C. The whole of the Elohist Document was post-exilic. Kuenen adopted the theories of Hupfeld and Graf and taught in addition that "the religion of Israel is a purely natural religion, beginning, like all other great religions, with polytheism, and developing gradually into the monotheistic and spiritual system of the prophets of Israel." Wellhausen elaborated this theory so as to include the following points: (1) The credible recorded history of Israel dates from the time of Samuel. (2) With Samuel begins the crystallization of the religion of Israel into its present form, the process continuing through centuries. (3) The Hexateuch is a composite work. (a) First we have a writer designated J = a Jehovist, a Judæan prophetic historian, who composed a history of Israel about 800 B. C. (b) Then have we a writer E = an Elohist, an Ephraimite prophetic historian, who wrote a similar work about 750 B. C. These two were fused together by a redactor, JE, about 700 B. C. (c) Then we have a third writer, D = the Deuteronomist, who wrote the main portion of Deuteronomy in Josiah's reign, 621 B. C. Another redactor, JED, united Deuteronomy to JE with some further additions to Deuteronomy. (d) Then we have a fourth main writer, P = Priests' Code, who began to write this ritual law in Ezekiel's time, 600 B. C. There were three parallel forms of this which were codified by Ezra 444

B. C., and sometime between 444 and 280 B. C. it was joined by another redactor to JED, which gives us the Hexateuch in its present form. This you observe destroys much of Ewald's theory. Ewald said the Elohist was first and Deuteronomy was last, but Wellhausen insists that the Jehovist was first, then the Elohist, then the Deuteronomist, then the Priests' Code. Dillmann held, in opposition, that the Priests' Code was before the Jehovist and Elohist, and Deuteronomy was last. So there you are. When doctors disagree who shall decide?

Meanwhile similar methods of study were applied to the other books of the Bible, including those of the New Testament. It is impossible for us to do more than glance at the theories at present held with reference to the Hexateuch and several of the prophetic books. We shall not attempt to discuss the problems of the New Testament. The most generally accepted theory held at present is as follows:

In the Hexateuch we have at least four documents. (1) The Jehovist J, is the oldest of all; the work of a Judean compositor or editor, a prophetic historian, not earlier than the time of Hosea and Amos, 800 B. C., *i. e.*, about 600 years after Moses. This document begins at Genesis 2 : 4. Large portions* of Genesis and Exodus belong to this writer, while nothing from his pen appears in the rest of the Hexateuch. The Elohist E, is next in order; a north Israelite or Ephraimite prophetic historian, or Relator, called by some the second Elohist, the third a Theocratic Relator, who wrote according to Wellhausen about 750 B. C.; about 850 B. C., according to Dillmann. This document first appears in Genesis 20 : 1. Large portions of Genesis and Exodus are his work.

The Deuteronomist D, comes next, who wrote during the reign of Josiah, about 621 B. C. To him must be assigned the most of Deuteronomy and small portions in other books of the Hexateuch. According to the critics, Deuteronomy cannot be the work of Moses, though much of its matter is very ancient, being an adaptation of older legislation in the light of

* Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, p. 373.

prophetic teaching. It is the book of the law found in the temple by Hilkiah, in Josiah's time² (Ki, 22). "The majority of critics believe this book of the law to have been the result of a pious fraud promulgated by Hilkiah and Shaphan, with the intention of deceiving Josiah into the belief that the reforms which they desired were the express command of God revealed to Moses."* It was supposed that these proposed reforms would carry much more weight if connected with the venerated name of Moses. But we are told we must not regard this pious act as a forgery since literary methods were not as strict then as now, and plagiarism was more universally practiced. It is hard to restrain one's indignation in the face of such statements. And thus we are asked to believe that our Divine Lord quoted from and endorsed the teachings of a book which was a pious fraud. But what is a *pious* fraud? What is a pious lie? Is our Lord to be appealed to as endorsing the infamous doctrine that the end justifies the means?

The next main document in the make-up of the Pentateuch is the so-called Priestly Code, a Ritual Law, known also as the First Elohist, the Foundation Document, a Book of Origins of Ewald, The Annalistic Relator. It is the last and most highly developed form of the Hebrew legislation. It begins with Gen. 1 : 1-2 : 4, and to it belong portions of Gen. and Ex.; at least 16 chaps. of Leviticus (17-26 are doubtful), nearly all of Numbers and parts of Joshua. This comprehends the whole of the ritual or ceremonial law. It began to be written down in the time of Ezekiel, was codified by Ezra, 444 B. C., and was added to the Hexateuch in complete form sometime between 444 and 280 B. C. In other words it is post-exilic. Yet some critics are disposed to allow an earlier date for what is called "The Covenant Code" (Ex. 20 : 22-24 : 8), also Miriam's Song in Ex. 15, and some few poetical fragments.

Here, then, in the Hexateuch we have four main documents, the Jehovist, the Second Elohist, the Deuteronomist, the Priest Code. No part of the Hexateuch, as we have it, is older than

* Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, p. 368.

850 B. C., except possibly portions of the Covenant Code just mentioned. The Elohist document dates from about 750 B. C.; Deuteronomy from 621 B. C., and is a pious fraud; the Priest Code from after the exile in Babylon. You observe what a radical departure this is from the traditional view. Dr. Geo. Adam Smith, of Glasgow, Scotland, considered one of the conservative Higher Critics gives "this principal conclusion of modern criticism—that the written law of Israel, in the three forms in which we possess it (*i. e.*, Covenant Code, Deuteronomic Code, Priest-Code) cannot have been the work of Moses, or of the Mosaic, or of the immediately post-Mosaic age, but must be assigned to a much later date." * He also declares the first eleven chapters of Gen. "do not contain a transcript of actual history in the narrower sense of that word." † He assures us however that this fact that their framework is woven of the raw material of myth and legend cannot discredit the profound moral and religious truths with which they are charged, any more than the cosmogony of his time which Milton employs, impairs by one whit our spiritual indebtedness to *Paradise Lost*. ‡ All of which may be true if the Bible is not and does not claim to be, a book different in character from *Paradise Lost*. But the Bible is a book different from *Paradise Lost* or any other merely human book. Again, Dr. Smith tells us that "the legendary character of these stories" does not altogether destroy their historical value. § The Fall of Man is "a prose-poem." || As to the reality of the patriarchs he has this to say, ¶ "We perceive, *first*, that many of the personal names are names of tribes as well; *second*, that the characters described in the individuals are the characters developed in the history of the corresponding tribes; and *third*, that the transactions between individuals, who bear tribal names may often be most naturally explained as transactions between tribes." ** These "stories of the Hebrew patriarchs are just

* *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament*, p. 53.

† *Id.*, p. 90.

‡ *Id.*, p. 92.

§ *Id.*, p. 92.

|| *Id.*, p. 93.

¶ *Id.*, p. 102.

** Ryle (*Hastings Bib. Dict.* p. 147) says the attempts to resolve the

what their late date would lead as to expect; efforts to account for the geographical distribution of neighboring nations, for their affinities, contrasts and mutual antipathies, and in particular, for the composite character of Israel."* That is, a late historian invents fictitious stories to account for these facts and palms them off as veritable history, and as such they have been accepted by all classes of writers and by millions of God's dear children during the centuries, until the critics of the 19th century with their superior wisdom have been able so to dissect the stories as to give us the real facts. This strikes me as unmitigated nonsense. But here is a great concession by Dr. Smith. "With critics there has been a distinct reaction of late in favor of admitting the personal reality of Abraham; no one has ever doubted that of Moses; while Joshua's personality rests to-day on surer grounds than in the earlier stages of criticism."† We may rest in peace. The critics allow us to retain a belief in the reality of Abraham and Moses and Joshua! I have quoted Dr. Smith so largely because he is one of the most recent writers, and has been supposed to belong to the conservative school. And I am seeking to present the present status of higher criticism on the Pentateuch.

For centuries the Jewish and Christian Churches have, with practical unanimity, accepted the prophecy of Isaiah as the authentic work of Isaiah the son of Amoz. But the higher critics insist that we must give up this cherished belief. Modern criticism claims that the book of Isaiah falls into three parts. Chapters 1-35 are the work of Isaiah, except possibly 24-27, which must be assigned to the beginning of the post-exilic period. Chapters 36-39 form an historical appendix to the first part, and are considerably later in date. Chapters 40-66 are by some great unknown, called for convenience Deutero-Isaiah, and are positively post-exilic. This is a most general statement. There are great divergencies among the critics,

patriarchs into abstract personifications have "admittedly failed." Kittel says, "Without the patriarchs the religious position of Moses stands before us unsupported and incomprehensible."

* *Mod. Criticism*, p. 104.

† *Id.*, p. 107.

Some divide the third section into at least three parts and assign them to different authors. Here are at least four Isaiahs, and the number, according to some critics, runs up much higher. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, of Oxford University, who possibly would resent being called a rationalist, and yet who represents the extreme radical school of higher criticism, in his new *Encyclopaedia Biblica* following Duhm and Hackmann, has subjected the first thirty-five chapters of Isaiah to a minute analysis, and he denies the Isaian authorship of the major portion of it. Indeed there is very little left as the work of Isaiah the son of Amoz. We cannot examine the grounds of this analysis in detail. In brief, it is claimed in respect of the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah that the historical background differs materially from that of 1-39, that Isaiah does not claim to be the author, that the literary style is different from the former; that the ideas and doctrines of the latter part differ from the former, and that Isaiah relates as history what has been erroneously considered prophecy, *e. g.*, his statements about Cyrus. None of these arguments carry much weight with a devout student of Isaiah. The trouble with Isaiah is that his prophecy is entirely too definite for the critics. It involves a supernatural element, and this is precisely what the rationalistic school, at least, will not admit. If one will even cursorily examine Dr. Cheyne's edition of Isaiah, in colors, with the notes, he will feel, I think, the utter weakness and inadequacy of his arguments for the composite characters of the book. We cannot enter more fully into the subject here. We can merely state that none of the critical arguments we have seen have shaken our confidence one whit in the Isaian authorship of those matchless passages in Isaiah, chapters 40-66.* We are

*The testimony of the New Testament as to the Isaian authorship of chapters 40-66 apparently counts for little with these critics. It is very easy to say that they shared the current notion and the popular ignorance of their times. But this again invalidates the historical trustworthiness of the New Testament writers. Compare Matt. 3 : 3, Luke 3 : 4, John 1 : 23 with Isaiah 40 : 3; Matt. 8 : 17 with Isaiah 53 : 4; Matt. 12 : 17, 18 with Isaiah 42 : 1; John 12 : 38, Rom. 10 : 16 with Isaiah 53 : 1; Rom. 10 : 20, 21 with Isaiah 65 : 1, 2.

not yet ready to give up these priceless portions of the Holy Word. The critics may say they do not want us to give them up; but if we must deny their historical trustworthiness, and look upon much of the book as a forgery then our confidence in it is gone.*

Already in the third century Porphyry attempted to prove the spuriousness of the book of Daniel. "Spinoza in the 17th century, Collins and Corrodi in the 18th, Eichhorn, Bleek, Ewald and others in the 19th, disputed, while Hengstenberg, Keil, Hävernick, Delitzsch, and others defended its genuineness."† The unity of the book is now universally conceded. Bleek acknowledged this and then denied its genuineness. The attack is now upon its genuineness and credibility. Many acknowledge the historical reality of Daniel but deny his authorship of this book. We are assured by Dr. E. L. Curtiss‡ that the genuineness of Daniel has now been generally abandoned, and that the book in its present form must be assigned to the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, (175-163 B. C). Daniel is not prophecy, according to the critics, but the writer writes history down to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes under the veiled form of prophecy, which is little short of charging him with downright dishonesty. The presence of three solitary Greek words in Daniel, the names of musical instruments, § proves

* The unique message of the Great Unknown, Isaiah 40-66, is "that the sorrowing ones are the triumphant ones, that suffering love is conquering love, that sorrow is victor. Christ's life and death will illustrate and exemplify this truth." Lyman Abbott, *Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews*, p. 371. This is taken as the meaning of those sublime passages concerning the Suffering Servant of Jehovah. This may be very fine sentiment and it expresses a great truth, but it is meant to eliminate the element of predictive prophecy in the passages. Dr. Abbott's school of critics account for the prophetic messages quite otherwise than the Bible itself. They say that the prophets were simply preachers of righteousness to the men of their day and spoke as preachers of any age should speak. But the Scriptures say that the Holy Ghost spoke through them, and that they spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. Cf. John 12: 41.

† Rishell, *The Higher Criticism*, p. 147.

‡ Hastings Bible Dict., p. 552.

§ Cf. *Hom. Rev.*, Vol. 44, p. 305.

that the book could not have been written until after the Greek conquest of the East by Alexander in 332 B. C. And this despite the fact that there seems to be clear evidence of the presence of Greeks at the court of Babylon at the time of Daniel and prior thereto.* (The rhetorical style of Daniel, its historical allusions, some of its doctrines, and its inclusion among the Hagiographa instead of among the Prophets in the present Hebrew Bibles, are argued as proofs of its composition at least 370 years after the real Daniel). Here again it is the marvellous character of the prophecies of Daniel that trouble the critics. It too plainly involves the supernatural. Of course our Lord endorses the book of Daniel, but then He, according to these scholars, shared in the errors and general ignorance of His times and people, or lent Himself to popular error on the subject for purposes of influence and instruction. But, excuse me, I for one cannot yet bring myself so to dishonor my blessed Divine Lord.

The problem of Jonah has been an interesting battle-ground for the critics. Are the contents of the book pure myth with no foundation in fact whatsoever; or legend with a slight basis of fact; or allegory, or parable, a veritable history. The critics now universally deny that it is the work of Jonah, the son of Amittai, 2 Kings 14 : 25.† It has been held to be (1) pure myth; (2) a mixture of legend and history; (3) a didactic poem; (4) a symbolical prophecy; (5) a pure legend. Dr. Abbott calls it a satire.‡ All agree that it is not prophecy, and yet all agree in some objective value in the book of a superior kind. Some think it was intended as a lesson to the prophets, others, to teach "God's love for the heathen and to rebuke the Jews for their narrowness and bigotry."§ The critics date the book from the post-exilic period. Smith (p. 89) calls it a sermon in the form of a parable. But read Christ's parables and their setting, then read Jonah and see if you can find

* Cf. Anderson, *Mod. Criticism and the Bible*, p. 131, note.

† Rishell, p. 142.

‡ Zenos, *Elements of Higher Criticism*, p. 221.

§ Rishell, p. 144.

any justification for such a view. There is no room here to enter into an examination of the historic reality of the book. I am simply giving the present critical view of it.

We have taken a mere glance at Higher Criticism at the present, as it affects a small portion of the Old Testament, but this is all we may here attempt. Now as to the subject in general, in its present-day aspects, we may observe—

1. That there continues to be such a wide divergence of view among critical scholars as to impair the validity of their conclusions. We are reminded again and again by the critics that there is substantial agreement among themselves; that the results of modern criticism must be accepted because they are vouched for by so many eminent names with such substantial unanimity. But whilst we may grant this unanimity as to the general assumptions of higher criticism, and as to its main contention the composite character of the Pentateuch and of many of the historical and prophetic books, and an origin and date different from that of the traditional view, yet when we seek for this unanimity in further results we cannot find it. And this necessarily leads us to question the infallibility of the higher critics. Theory after theory once held so confidently has been abandoned. The Documentary Theory of Eichhorn yielded to the Fragmentary Hypothesis of Gerdts and Vater and this in turn to the Supplemental theory of De Wette, which itself had to give way before Ewald's dogmatic advocacy of the Crystalization Hypothesis; and today we have, in general, a modified form of the Wellhausen theory. But the latter has revolutionized the whole critical situation of former days.

We must discriminate among higher critics. There are higher critics who hold largely to the traditional views of the Scripture. The late Dr. Green, of Princeton, was a conspicuous example of this class. There are constructive Higher Critics and destructive Higher Critics. But taking the term in its ordinary usage as applying to those critics who hold views very essentially different from the traditional view of the Bible, we may make a rough classification into conservative, or semi-evangelical, and radical, or rationalistic. Many of these

critics labor to assure us of their reverent love, their sincere search for the truth, and of their recognition of the supernatural element in the Bible. They gravely tell us that it contains a divine revelation, and that their efforts are directed to eliminating errors and difficulties, separating the truly historical from the fictitious, and explaining on rational grounds many of the things that have proved stumbling blocks from the traditional standpoint. We must assume their sincerity and honesty in these declarations, whilst we strenuously insist that their work creates vastly more difficulties than it resolves. Prof. Addis, of Oxford, speaks of his deepening conviction that Israel was the subject of a divine guidance, in the strictest sense supernatural and unique, till He came to whom the law and the prophets alike bear witness."* Dr. Lyman Abbott thinks the result of the new criticism will be to destroy that faith in the letter which killeth, and to promote that faith in the spirit which maketh alive; to lead the Christian * * * to regard the Bible not as a book of philosophy about religion, but as a book of religious experiences, the more inspiring religious life of man, because frankly recognized as a book simply, naively, divinely human."† But consider what it amounts to that the Bible is "simply a book of religious experiences," a book "naively, divinely human." Prof. George Adam Smith, of Oxford, one of the most brilliant of recent English critics of the conservative school, though he seems to be fast going over to the radicals, repeatedly affirms that the Bible contains a record of a real revelation of God, and he seeks to show us how much divine revelation modern criticism has left us in the Bible. He assures us that on the present evidence it is impossible to be sure of more than a substratum of actual history in the stories of the patriarchs, "but," he asks, "who wants to be sure of more?" If a preacher cannot be sure of Genesis, "let him seek his texts elsewhere; his field

* Quoted in *Hom. Rev.*, Vol. 39, p. 509.

† By the way what does divinely human mean? We rightly speak of the Divine-human Christ; and we believe this compound term best characterizes the Scriptures. But this is something entirely different from divinely human.

is wide and inexhaustible."* Though Genesis is untrustworthy as history yet "as preachers we cannot refuse to follow the narratives of Genesis until we refuse to follow the parables of Jesus."† In other words, writers of this school insist that we can reject the historical trustworthiness of the Hexateuch and Historical Books, regard Deuteronomy as a pious fraud and Jonah as a parable, allegory, myth or legend, give up David's authorship of any of the Psalms, hold to a half dozen authors of the prophecy of Isaiah, bring down the Priest's Code to the time of Ezra and Daniel to the Maccabean period, and yet claim that the Bible contains an authoritative revelation, and that its character is not thus impaired but improved. Well, perhaps some men capable of extraordinary feats of intellectual legerdemain may do so, but scarcely the ordinary Christian. Some of these critics may be able to do so because in their early training they were so saturated with the truth of the Bible that their hearts still cling to it, while their heads reject its integrity.

The radical school does not mince matters much. Two notable Bible Dictionaries have recently appeared, *Hastings*, representing in general the more conservative school, and "The Encyclopaedia Biblical," edited by Dr. T. K. Cheyne, of Oxford, the more radical. According to Dr. Cheyne, "Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are lunar heroes." Here he follows Hugo Winckler, who regards the patriarchs as astral myths. Cheyne allows his exuberant fancy to run riot in conjectures, and then calmly asks us to accept them as emendations of the Biblical history. The virgin birth of Jesus is denied and Paul is robbed of every last one of his epistles in Cheyne's Dictionary. Cheyne raises the question whether any credible elements are to be found in the gospels at all. He finally concludes to save us nine passages from the general wreck, though the story of the empty sepulchre must be given up.* Dr. Driver, of Oxford, is considered quite an advanced higher critic, yet Cheyne says of him that "his sympathy with

* *Mod. Criticism*, etc., p. 108.

† *Id.*, p. 109.

‡ Anderson, *Modern Criticism and the Bible*, p. 7.

old fashioned readers has led him to forget the claims of criticism."* Driver says the Hebrew of Daniel is of much later age than the 6th century B. C. But Cheyne does not agree with him.† Kuenen boldly takes the position that "we must either cast aside as worthless our dearly-bought scientific method or must forever cease to acknowledge the authority of the New Testament in the domain of the exegesis of the Old Testament. Without hesitation we choose the latter alternative." Kuenen acknowledges: "It is the common conviction of all the writers of the New Testament that the Old Testament is inspired of God and is thus invested with divine authority." And yet this testimony must be thrown overboard by the wholesale in order to save the modern scientific method. What are we to think of such an attitude toward the Word of God? Cornhill, of Königsburg, seems to accept the historicity of Jonah, while others reject it; though Cornhill claims that the Old Testament narratives give us "an absolutely false representation of the religious history of the people."‡ The critics are not absolutely agreed as to the order of the Codes, as to the number of the Redactors in the Pentateuch, as to the partition of the Hexateuch and of Isaiah, the character of Daniel's or Jonah's prophecies. Such experts as Wellhausen, Stade, Kuenen, Cornhill, Stark, Addis, Driver, Cheyne, differ materially on many points. Dr. Willis Beecher is right in saying that these differences may show independent study, but they certainly also show the fallibility of the experts. Dr. Driver writes that "Criticism in the hands of Christian scholars does not banish or destroy the inspiration of the Old Testament; it presupposes it."§

The critics admit that the divine authority of the Old Testament was taught by Christ, but then they make Christ "the dupe of the current Jewish nation."|| We are told that our Lord's knowledge of critical questions was no greater than

* *Id.*, p. 41.

† *Id.*, p. 44.

‡ *Hom. Rev.*, Vol. 39, p. 503.

§ *Introduction to Literature of Old Testament.*

|| Anderson, *Mod. Crit.*, p. 73.

that of his contemporaries; Jesus simply shared in the popular notions of his time and Jesus was mistaken. If this is considered dishonoring to our divine Lord the critics fall back upon an unwarranted and distorted view of the doctrine of the Kenosis. The New York *Independent* boldly declares the story of Adam and Eve a myth. St. Paul speaks of Adam as an historical personage, but St. Paul was mistaken. He did not know what he was talking about and the editor of *The Independent* does. And so the merry war goes on. In general, the conservative critics admit a supernatural element in the Bible; the practical result of the radical contention eliminates it. Dr. G. A. Smith acknowledges that modern criticism "has been forced to abandon some positions which it had previously accepted with confidence, and upon innumerable details still exhibited among its supporters differences of opinion."* If this is true—and who can deny it?—we may certainly be excused from accepting the infallibility of the critics. We may properly question the validity of many of their conclusions.

2. Again the careful student cannot fail to notice the precariousness of the methods of the Higher Criticism. This is as pronounced to-day as formerly. Sometimes it is claimed that none but experts are competent to pass upon the questions involved here. The claim is not well founded. The critics themselves acknowledge that their results are not all, or chiefly, or necessarily, obtained from a study of the Hebrew of the Old Testament. Indeed the literary argument is not so much depended upon as formerly. Sir Robert Anderson does not hesitate to declare that "a knowledge of Hebrew has nothing whatever to do with the question of the authenticity of the books of Moses," (p. 44). It is really a question of evidence. It involves the examination of testimony. And here ordinary intelligence and common sense have a place, not to speak of a highly trained mind in general. Moreover the testimony of experts is to be received with caution. It is apt to be one-sided and warped. Expert testimony in a court of law is not necessarily conclusive. One expert will testify that two specimens of handwriting are from one and the same person;

* *Modern Criticism*, etc., p. 32.

another will testify to the contrary. Such conflict of expert testimony is by no means uncommon. An eminent jurist declares as the judgment of the Judicial Bench of Great Britain that no kind of testimony needs more the test of cross-examination than that of experts. And Sir Robert Anderson, of the King's Bench, remarks that "the history of the Higher Criticism movement gives abundant proof that no class of expert is more untrustworthy than the critic."* Again and again this writer inveighs against the weakness of the evidence upon which the higher critics demand acceptance of their conclusions. He examines the evidence from the standpoint of a jurist and this is his deliberate conclusion. With this, it seems to me, every candid mind must agree. We resent the claim that no one but an expert can judge of the trustworthiness of the testimony. If this testimony cannot stand the test of fair intelligence and common sense it is not worthy of acceptance.

Moreover, during the last few years, an enormous literature has been put into our hands. And as Kuenen says, "the Bible is in every one's hand. The critic has no other Bible than the public." We have a perfect right then to an independent examination of the testimony, though we may not pose as experts. In general, the method of the Higher Critics are threefold. The LITERARY METHOD is based on qualities of expression. It aims to determine the origin, form and value of the Biblical writings by a minute study of their vocabulary, idioms phrases, rhetorical qualities of style and expression, on the assumption that "the style is the man." It is assumed that every writer will have his own individual style of composition and that he will always be consistent therewith. All this is true in general. And yet there are many elements of precariousness in it. A writer may vary his style in different kinds of composition, at different times, and ages of life, in different moods. To identify a man's style there must be at hand a considerable body of undisputed writings from his hand. This argument is not now used with the same confidence as formerly. "Vernes insists that the argument from style is absolutely worth-

* *Mod. Crit. and The Bible*, p. 48.

less."* To this day it has been impossible for the literary critics to identify the famous "Letters of Junius." Now think of it. We have only the prophecy of Isaiah from the pen of Isaiah. There are no other writings of his with which to compare this prophecy. And yet we are asked to believe that the critics can determine what part of this prophecy was written by the Son of Amoz, what by a second narrator, what by a redactor, what by a third or fourth narrator and what by the Deutero-Isaiah.

The precariousness of this method led to the development of THE HISTORICAL METHOD. This argument is based on the assumption that cotemporaneous history is reflected in any writing of that age. This method includes the argument that the facts and institutions of any age will appear in its literary products; also the argument from anachronism and the argument from silence. This method has its legitimate place and great value. But it must be used cautiously, and the conclusions reached through its employment must be carefully inspected before they can be accepted as valid. In the case of the biblical records we are dependent entirely on the records themselves for many of the facts and institutions recorded. Comparatively few are known from other sources.

THE THEOLOGICAL METHOD is the argument from the content of thought found in the writings. It is claimed that an author's thought is characteristic of him; likewise also the development of his thought.

We have no desire to depreciate the efficiency and the value of any of these methods, nor to reflect upon the critics who use them legitimately. But we insist that they must all be employed with caution, and whilst they may furnish us valuable hypotheses, we must be chary in accepting the absolute validity of the results so obtained. Different critics using these same methods arrive at materially different results, though they may agree in certain main features. This should teach us caution in accepting their results. In view, therefore, of the precar-

* Dr. Behrend, O. T. under Fire, p. 122.

iousness of the critical methods employed, and the fatal weakness of much of the evidence advanced, we resent being classed as "brainless idiots" if we do not at once accept the results of faulty logic or of mere conjecture.

Many of the arguments of the critics are based upon mere assumptions. Underlying the whole work of criticism, since Graf's time, is the theory of evolution. The scientific theory of development is assumed in the biblical history. There is distinct progress, we are assured, from the primitive to the organized; from the rude to the cultivated; from polytheism to monotheism; from the tribal conception of God to a conception of God as universal sovereign. A more detailed and elaborate law must hence be later in date than a more simple one. Hence the Deuteronomic Code must be later than the Covenant Code of Ex. 20 : 22-24 : 8, because it is more elaborate than the latter. The Priestly Code of Leviticus and Numbers—the ritual law concerning the Tabernacle, Priesthood, Sacrifices—must be later than the Deuteronomic, because it is still more specific. You can easily see what violence this does to the historical narrative.* And that makes necessary another assumption, that the Pentateuch is primarily a body of legislation, and that the history is subordinate to the laws. The critical methods are then applied in accordance with this assumption. But we have been taught to believe, what lies on the

* But the testimony of the monuments is making havoc of this evolutionary hypothesis. In an article in the *Hom. Review* for June, 1902, Prof. Sayce says, as one of the results of recent archaeological work in Egypt, "We have learned that at what was formerly regarded as the very beginning of its history, the culture and civilization of the people were as highly developed as they were at any subsequent period. Indeed, in some respects the art of later Egypt shows a decline. * * * The traditional account of it (*i. e.*, the highly civilized Egypt of Menes) was declared to be mythical or fictitious, and critical analysis had proved it to be unworthy of credit. Such was the house of cards erected by 'criticism,' a few blows of the excavator's spade have levelled it with the ground. * * * The vindication of the historical reality of Menes means the vindication also of the historical reality of the Hebrew patriarchs." Prof. Hilprecht's splendid work in Biblical Lands tends in the same direction. The critics will now be obliged to go vastly farther back than the patriarchs for the age of myth and legend and semi-barbarism.

surface of these books, that the Pentateuch is primarily history, much of it constitutional history, and that the laws find their appropriate place in the course of the history. And we shall demand stronger evidence than that so far presented before we accept this new critical assumption. Another assumption of the critics is that the non-observance of a law or a body of laws proves its non-existence. Because in Judges and some of the historical books but scant reference is made to the Levitical legislation, and it seems not to have been observed, or fully observed, therefore it did not then exist. It could not have originated until after the exile, and the pious (Sic) priests who wrote it connected it with the revered name of Moses to secure for it greater authority. But history contradicts this assumption. Dr. Behrend* is right in maintaining that the historical criticism of the Old Testament, so far as its results are revolutionary and destructive, proceeds upon utterly unwarrantable assumptions. It denies the reality of supernatural revelation and guidance. It sneers at miracles and discredits any history which contains them. It resolves predictions into happy guesses, or regards them as uttered *post eventum*." One eminent higher critic (Addis) says of another (Stärk), "He heaps conjecture upon conjecture, and they remain mere conjectures notwithstanding his constant assurance that this is 'clear,' and that 'without doubt.'"[†] Prof. Cheyne begins his analysis of the Psalms "by assigning a later Psalm to a probable date. This result 'established' he determines the date of another psalm, and so repeats the process backward until the supposed earliest psalms are reached."[‡] He thus begins with a probability, agrees on probabilities, and then demands that we accept his conclusions as certainties. But we prefer to be excused. A historian *may* assume that the battle of Yorktown took place in 1807, and then determine the date of the Battle of Bunker Hill and the Declaration of Independence therefrom. But what will be thought of such a history? Theoretically

* *Old Testament Under Fire*, p. 22.

† *Hom. Rev.*, Vol. 39, p. 508.

‡ Rishell, *Higher Criticism*, p. 167.

the critics discredit conjecture, or permit it tentatively as a last resort; but practically they build up many of their arguments and base many of their conclusions upon it.

I have often been struck with the tendency of the critics to exaggerate difficulties, to insist on finding discrepancies, to conjure up contradictions; to magnify differences of detail; to discredit the testimony of the Bible and accept the slenderest facts from other sources that seem in conflict with the Bible. The thought has often come up, why is not the testimony of the Bible just as valid and valuable as this bit from some other, in many cases unknown or unidentified source. But it seems to be a settled principle with many of the critics that the benefit of the doubt *must not* be given to the Bible. The same process applied to any accredited modern writing would yield largely the same results. Dr. Green has shown how these methods may be applied to the parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan, and how they yield us two distinct documents as sources in each case, and another writer has done the same with the Epistle to the Romans. I wish I might have time to give illustrations of these statements just made. Take as one, the story of Joseph, as given in Gen. 37. We quote here Dr. Behrend (p. 128). It contains 127 lines in an Oxford Bible. "The critics assign it to five different hands, and distribute the parts as follows: Three lines fr. P, 3 fr. JE, 2 lines gloss, 1 ½ fr. E, 7 fr. J, 1 ½ fr. E, 1 fr. R, 9 fr. E, 2 fr. R, 4 ½ fr. E, 1 fr. R, 6 ½ fr. E, 23 fr. JE, 6 fr. E, 1 word fr. R, 2 lines fr. J, 5 fr. E, 2 ½ fr. JE, 1 fr. J, 3 ½ fr. JE, 1 fr. J, 3 ½ fr. JE, 11 fr. J, 2 fr. E, 2 fr. J, 8 ½ fr. E, 6 ½ fr. J, 3 fr. E, 5 fr. J, 2 ½ fr. E. And yet I am to be called a brainless idiot if I cannot believe such bosh as that! I can scarcely forbear quoting these strong statements from Dr. Dewart, of Toronto, Canada,* "That the Bible account of the history of the religion of Israel is more consistent and probable than the fanciful reconstruction which has been substituted for it. That the theories of these critics are largely based on un-

* *Hom. Review*, Vol. 43, p. 122.

verified conjectures. "That in dissecting and adjusting the Old Testament to make it accord with a preconceived theory, the higher critics use unscientific and unwarranted methods. That the many contradictory differences of leading critics discredit their methods and conclusions."

3. Again we are struck with the acknowledged uncertainty of the results of the Higher Criticism. As we read, we are informed that this is "probably" the correct order; it was "possibly" so and so; it is "likely" that a Redactor wrote this; the results here are "uncertain," etc. I open Dr. Driver's Introduction, p. 12, and I read, "In the details of the analysis of JE, there is sometimes uncertainty, owing to the criteria being indecisive." Of course! Again certain verses "may have been expounded or glossed by the compiler" (p. 15). Certainly, and again, they may not have been. In Gen., 34th chapter, "the analysis throughout is not equally certain (p. 15). "Other verses have probably been expanded or recast by the compiler." These are specimens at random. I turn to Dr. Smith's *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament* (p. 42) and I read, "From the nature of the materials, much uncertainty must, of course, prevail." Again (p. 42), "Here the work of the critic is necessarily extremely delicate, and the results are often uncertain." And so again and again. Turn to Cheyne's *Isaiah*, to Hasting's *Bible Dictionary*, to any works of this class, and the same fact greets you repeatedly. Now I insist that when there is such widespread uncertainty in the results, coupled with such precariousness of method, we need not be too eager to accept the conclusions of the critics, nor should we be charged with unworthy conservatism in taking such a position. When there is not quite so much of "probability" and "possibility", and "uncertainty" about them we may more readily accept them. But when it comes to guessing, I prefer to stand to my guessing, if it is a guess, with the historic Church of God throughout the centuries, with the noble army of the martyrs with the goodly company of the saints, with the holy band of the apostles and with the Blessed Lord Himself!

4. Again, we are impressed with the dogmatism and the ar-

rogance of the higher critics. It is similar to that of the scientists who advocate the doctrine of evolution. The poor layman who dares to question the truth of this hypothesis, for it is still no more than that, is tabooed as behind the times, a poor moss-back of a bygone age of intellectual darkness. Whilst the scientists, in working out this hypothesis, have laid the intellectual world under an immense debt, yet so long as there are so many and such awful breaks in the chain of the evolutionary hypothesis, we may justify our refusal to accept its teachings *in toto*, especially in reference to man. And so with the Higher Criticism. Let us cheerfully acknowledge our indebtedness to these profound and patient scholars. They have given the Bible an historical setting it never had before; they have shed much light upon many dark problems; they have helped to clear up many difficulties; they have compelled a modification of some traditional views of the Holy Scriptures for which the Bible itself was in no way responsible. Let us cordially grant that they have done us an immense service, and that many of them, perhaps most of them, are sincere and honest in their search for the truth, and that they mean to be thoroughly reverent in tone and method and spirit. And yet all this does not justify their extreme dogmatism and arrogance. They claim practical certainty for their conclusions, and hence there is no room to differ with them. They are right and the rest are wrong. They apparently forget the instability of critical opinions in the past. Fifty years ago Ewald was the power in the critical world. But Ewald speaks freely of the failure of Ilgen's studies, and characterizes Hupfeld and Knobel as "unsatisfactory and perverse," and the opinions of such eminent scholars as Hengstenberg, Delitzsch, Keil and Kurtz as standing "below and outside of all science." He arrogantly claimed the field all to himself. Ewald resolved the entire patriarchal history into a myth, because he positively assumed that the art of writing was unknown in the time of Moses. Yet no sane scholar would dare maintain that opinion to-day, and his crystallization theory has been driven from the field by the Kuenen-Wellhausen. Present-day scholars are as arrogant

as Ewald, and likely will so continue until their theories are forced into the background by some new hypothesis. The new school claims the victory. Dr. Smith says that* "Modern Criticism has won its war against Traditional theories. It only remains to fix the amount of the indemnity." This remarkable statement exhibits the temper of most of the critics. Then he proceeds to fix the indemnity by asking "What does criticism leave to us in the Old Testament; how much true history and how much revelation?" He tries to assure us that only a small portion of the Old Testament has been affected. For instance, we do not enter real history until the time of Samuel; the two stories of David's introduction to Saul are irreconcilable, and his dictum is, "What an advantage, then, has the preacher of to-day who can frankly say: These are two different traditions of the same event, and confine himself to the rich material and moral issues of the one or the other?" But not every honest man can so easily satisfy himself. As Beecher long ago pointed out, a man cannot grow enthusiastic over an uncertainty. Some of the history of Elijah and Elisha we may retain, some must go; we must give up all of David's psalms; the book of Jonah is but a parable; Abraham we may possibly retain and Moses certainly, but the rest of the patriarchs must recede into the shadowy regions of limbo, while the creation and flood stories are myth or legend. This distinguished author speaks glibly of errors of date and authorship in the Old Testament books which scholars like himself are only now able to correct (p. 8). It is small wonder that Prof. Sayce protests against the papacy of the modern critical school. Cheyne, on the books of Nehemiah and Ezra says, "The traditional account is, I regret to say, to a large extent untrustworthy. Tradition has partly imagined facts where there were none, partly exaggerated the really existing facts." Alas! what a supreme pity that poor deluded Nehemiah and Ezra did not have Dr. Cheyne with them to give them the facts, and that Jews and Christians alike have been obliged to wait until the dawn of the Twentieth Century for this eminent critic

* *Modern Criticism, etc.*, p. 72.

to correct for them this Old Testament upon which they have relied with such confidence and which has been to them such a source of comfort and hope. Prof. Addis speaks of "modern scholars who can study Jeremiah's writings in a historical spirit, of which no author of fictitious history in early days was capable." The fictitious history here referred to is that of Kings and Chronicles. Certainly the words of one of the Lord Chancellors of England are in place here, "Writings of this character are far more dangerous to the simple-minded Christian than any direct attack upon his Master. They are very shockingly irreverent. A patronizing tone is assumed, which exhibits the critic as presuming to judge Him who will be our Judge (Anderson, p. 70).

5. And now just a word or two in conclusion. I have already referred incidentally to certain valuable results from modern critical study of the Bible. Let us not be slow to acknowledge this fact. It would be easy, had we the time, to indicate some of these benefits so received. They have taught us to review and revise some of our traditional theories for which the Bible itself never was responsible. Here is a distinct gain. What if there is evidence of the use of several documents in the Pentateuch? If so, Moses simply exercised the prerogative of the historians of every age in using any reliable extant documents in writing his history. No true scholar ever would claim that Moses got his ordinary historical facts in any other wise than other historians get theirs. And certainly we may grant that the postscript to Deuteronomy was added by another hand without impairing the Mosaic authorship or the inspiration of the Book. And so of some other minor points. But let us scrutinize carefully the methods and the alleged results of Higher Criticism before yielding to its demands. The critics practically claim the field of critical scholarship all to themselves. There is the ring of confident victory in their claims. The battle with the traditional theories has been fought and won, so they tell us. But we are not so sure of that. We have heard that boast before.

Let us not be alarmed. The followers of the now discredited Tübingen school made it again and again.

I am persuaded that even now the tide is turning. A reaction has set in. Two things have practically always followed from determined attacks upon the truth of God's word, and the integrity of that word. First the assailants have gotten into a conflict among themselves. One of the interesting things in the study of unbelief is to note how the different schools have been mutually destructive of each other. It is so now. The critics refute the critics. Cheyne's radicalism is causing a reaction. Another fact is that assaults on the truth have compelled its adherents to examine more thoroughly the foundation of belief on the points involved. This has resulted in a sifting out of error, in modifying, in some cases, former unguarded statements, and in new formulations of the truth that will stand the severest test. The cause of truth has thus gained immensely. It will be so here. Conservative scholars are busy with these modern problems as never before. Meanwhile let us not fear for the truth, but welcome the light from whatever source it comes. These are golden words from the late Dr. Greene, of Princeton: "Every attempt to interfere with freedom of inquiry on this subject should be frowned down from whatever quarter it may proceed, or by whatever object it may be actuated, and vigorous threshing will free the pure grain from the worthless chaff."* And so also are these words from Dr. Sinker:† "We are prepared as Christian men to receive and welcome the fullest light of the new learning. We are not prepared to be dragged at the wheels of those who would give us a discredited Old Testament, an emasculated New Testament, a fallible Christ."

One Sunday evening, a few weeks ago, the writer had a memorable and very comforting experience. The work of the day had been very hard, and I was unable to sleep. My mind ran on this subject, and especially on the attacks now being made on the integrity of the sacred Word. And the question came to me, as it has come to multitudes of others, "Will the

* Behrends *O. T. Under Fire*, p. 139.

† Anderson's *Mod. Critic*, p. 254.

old Book stand?" And then I thought, what a variety of theories have been held about the sun. Centuries ago, we are told, Pythagoras held that the sun was the center of our system. But presently the Ptolemaic theory won the day against him. Centuries after came the Copernican theory. For ages men have been speculating as to the character of the sun, the nature of his atmosphere, and have been trying to solve the great problems of his motion, influence and place in the universe system. Manifold theories have been proposed; some of them very silly and unscientific. But all this while the old sun has been shining with undimmed lustre, bathing the earth with his glorious light, and blessing plant and animal life. No matter what men have said of him, there is the sun as a fact in the material universe, and here on earth are his beneficent influences, despite all theories as to how they are effected. And so with God's blessed Word. There is the Bible as a fact, a fact to be reckoned with whether it can be fully or satisfactorily accounted for or not. And for ages this old earth has been witnessing the beneficent influences of the teachings of this old Book of God, despite all the attacks made upon its genuineness, credibility and integrity. Men may say what they please about it to-day, its origin and composition, and entertain any theories they desire as to its inspiration, it will go on giving light to the path, and joy to the heart of those who study its blessed pages in a reverent spirit; and its leaves will continue to be for the healing of the nations. I cannot describe the joy and the peace that came to my heart that night through this experience. "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven." "The word of the Lord endureth forever."

ARTICLE III.

THE TWO REFORMATION THEOLOGIES.

BY PROFESSOR J. W. RICHARD, D.D.

[CONCLUDED FROM PAGE 355.]

I. THE PARALLEL.

Having in the foregoing installments of this essay presented the fundamental principles of the Christian doctrine as held and stated in one way by Luther, and as held and stated in another way by Calvin, it may not be unprofitable to draw a parallel between these two great men as they stand before us in the character of theologians. This we purpose doing now in a few brief delineations.

But it must be said at the outstart that both Luther and Calvin held firmly by the authority of the divine word. The word of God, and that alone, should make articles of faith, though Luther was more influenced by traditional practices of the Church than was Calvin. And that they often conceived differently the meaning of the divine word on important subjects is doubtless due in part at least to differences in psychological organization, in Christian experience, and in external circumstances. Luther had suffered great mental distress on account of his sins, and was led to the experience of pardon partly through the ministry of the Church, and partly and permanently through the divine word. Luther became a reformer by restoring and revitalizing a much neglected and almost forgotten truth. Calvin accepted the Reformation when it had now an established place in the world. His own deep experiences would naturally lead Luther to gather his thoughts about Christ and his work for man. Circumstances and his own logical mind would naturally lead Calvin to concentrate his thoughts on the system, in which Christ and his work had place. Logically and by reason of his antecedents Calvin would

be led to emphasize the doctrine of God, who is the author and finisher of salvation with himself as the end of all his operations. In other words, Calvin would be inclined to lay the greater stress on the first article of the Creed, while Luther would be inclined, indeed inwardly necessitated, to lay the greater stress on the second article. Here at once we have cause for the characteristic distinction of the *per Christum*, and the *propter Christum*—the *in Christi willen*. The former places Christ more in the relation of an instrument to an antecedent purpose; the latter places him more in the relation of cause to a subsequent result. Calvin holds that salvation, which is antecedently determined by the eternal decree, comes to the elect *through Christ*. Luther holds that salvation comes to us *on account of Christ*, whose benefits are offered alike to all.

This distinction is not only characteristic, but it has great significance—the significance of the difference between a cause and an instrument. In the one case we have Christ placed at the very heart of the love of God, and made a fountain and cause of salvation. In the other case we hear Christ himself called *electus*, and see him standing at a distance from the purpose to save. We hear Luther say that “mercy is promised to us on account of Christ,” that “righteousness is reckoned to us on account of Christ.” We hear Calvin say that Christ is a means through which God extends his mercy to the elect, and is the mirror and pledge of the divine mercy. This difference means a great deal when logically carried out and applied in a system of theology. It makes the Lutheran theology more *christological*. It makes the Calvinistic theology more *theological*. It causes the one system to praise and magnify the provision in the divine economy for the redemption of man from sin and misery. It causes the other system to reverence and adore the provision made in the universe for the manifestation of the divine glory.

If we turn our attention specifically to the article of justification, we hear Luther call it “the master, the prince, the lord, the ruler, the judge over all kinds of doctrine, which governs all the doctrine of the Church, and raises up our conscience before God,” but we hear Calvin call justification the second proof of

our election. We hear Luther say that all the other articles follow from this article of justification, and hence that this article is "the head and sum of all the Christian doctrine." We hear Calvin say that "the first cause, both of our calling, and of all the benefits which we receive from God, is his eternal election." We find that Luther places justification before regeneration as its cause. In his *Catechismus* (1537) Calvin discusses Election and Predestination; then Faith, Faith as the gift of God, Justification. His formula is: "We are justified in Christ;" "we obtain life in Christ." In the *Institutes* Regeneration is postponed to Justification. Luther declares that all his theological studies gather round, proceed from, and return again to the article of Justification. He thus makes Justification his first fundamental principle. Calvin declares that Election is his first fundamental principle, and that "ignorance of this principle evidently detracts from the divine glory, and diminishes real humility."*

But if we go back of justification to God, we find ultimately a still greater difference between these two theologians. They do both indeed affirm the absolute sovereignty of God. But Luther makes a distinction between "the hidden God" and "the proclaimed God." With him it is "the hidden God," who is absolute. With this God we have nothing to do. "The proclaimed God" limits himself by his word. This is the God of our salvation. Calvin, so far as we have observed, makes no such distinction. With him God is God, and it is exactly with God's secret counsel that we have to do, inasmuch as by his secret counsel God determines the destiny of each individual of the human race. This secret counsel, according to Calvin, expresses itself through the Scriptures in Election and Reprobation. But according to Luther "the proclaimed God wills that all men be saved, inasmuch as by the word he comes to all." According to Calvin it is the eternal purpose of God to elect a few persons to salvation, and to reprobate all other persons to damnation. According to Luther it is the sincere purpose of God, as expressed in the Scriptures, to save all who believe. *Volui et tu noluisti*. According to Calvin Christ died for the

**Institutes*, II, XXI; I.

elect only; according to Luther "the Incarnate God was sent into the world, that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer for all men all things that are necessary unto salvation." According to Calvin only the elect are effectually called; according to Luther the call comes alike to all who hear the Gospel. According to Calvin faith is given to the elect only; according to Luther God offers grace to all alike in the word and sacraments, "and it is the fault of the will which does not admit him." According to Calvin they are justified who have been elected; according to Luther they are elected who diligently hear the Gospel and believe in Christ. According to Calvin the "all" included in the open call of the Gospel does not mean *omnes universaliter*, but only some of every rank and condition of life; according to Luther "in the revealed word God wills that all be saved, and if they believe that word they shall be saved." According to Calvin, not all who hear the word of God can believe, since the majority are judicially blinded and hardened; according to Luther "God wills that all men be saved without a single exception. * * * But that all men are not saved, not God, but man is the cause." And according to Calvin the Church is "wonderfully concealed in the bosom of a blessed predestination, and in the mass of a miserable damnation."* According to Luther Justification is "the head and cornerstone, which alone begets, nourishes, edifies, preserves, and defends the Church," and the Church is revealed by the word and the sacraments.

But in order to make this parallel more complete it will be necessary to exhibit the more practical side of Luther's idea of God. Growing out of his conception of "the proclaimed God," but so closely connected with it as to be a part of it, is his conception of God as *Love*, as *Holy Love*, and of his revealed will as the will of salvation. Luther does not deny, yea, he affirms, that God is omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent, sovereign. But he does not find the heart of God in omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, sovereignty. Pre-eminently does he find the heart of God in that attribute of his being, which is turned toward the world in Christ Jesus, and in the will of salvation

* *Institutes*, II, XXI, I.

that embraces all men (Ezek. 18 : 23). According to Luther we rightly see God in Christ Jesus, and "recognize him as a gracious Father, who gladly helps and saves us ; who daily points to all his works, and throughout the whole world preserves his creatures, does them good, richly bestows his blessing upon them, except where necessary and for the sake of the pious he must punish the wicked—who so governs that we always see more of his grace and goodness than of his wrath and punishment, for where one is sick, blind, dumb, paralytic, leprous, a hundred thousand are sound. A person may have a disorder in a part of his body, yet is the whole man, body and spirit, the pure goodness of God."*

And as the benevolence of God lets itself down to the humble, Luther declares that the "title and most appropriate definition of God is, Respector of the despised and humble." The love of God Luther describes as "the nature of God," as "the heart of God." He also distinguishes between "God's own work" and "God's strange work." "God's own work is beneficence and salvation. God's strange work is anger, judgment and condemnation. But even in the execution of this strange work God is beneficent, for thereby he seeks to humble us, and to draw us to himself. Indeed, God's anger exists only in appearance. He seems to be angry, yet he does not hate nor reject us, but sometimes he does, as Isaiah says (28 : 21), *alienum opus*, and pretends anger for the purpose of slaying the carnal mind, which is enmity against God. Job says, though he slay me, yet will I hope, for Job is certain that God thinks otherwise, and really is not angry."†

From Hosea 11 : 8 he draws this conclusion: "That heart aroused to wrath on account of the sins of men is *not the true* heart of God, the heart that is affected by our miseries, that burns daily with pity," etc.

"The idea intended to be conveyed by such declarations as these," says Köstlin, "is essentially the same as that embodied in the distinction drawn between God's strange work and his own or natural work. The nature of God is in itself pure love

* *Erl. Ed.*, 49 : 94.

† *Ex. Op.*, 5 : 176.

and goodness, but this very nature must also, when sin faces it, glow with zeal and act as a burning fire. In illustrating this thought, he compares God to the king (queen) among bees, which has no sting and injures no one, but which must for protection, in order not to be killed by the drones, have others about him that can sting. Thus God suffers all manner of calamities, and even the devil, to come out of hell, and he uses them as stings on every hand."*

To this fundamental idea of the divine love and goodness Luther gives a very practical term. In the small Catechism the children are taught that all the blessings of life come "through the pure, paternal, divine goodness and mercy." "Hence we conclude," says Luther in the Large Catechism, "that we Germans from ancient times call God (more beautifully than any other language) even by this name, deriving it from the word *Gut*, as he is an eternal fountain-head, which overflows with pure *goodness*, and from which issues all that is, or can be called good."

These ideas of God as enunciated and expounded by Luther, especially after 1525, and his conception of the means of grace as the true expression of the divine will towards man, and as instruments by which God works efficaciously on the minds and hearts of men, entered genetically into the Lutheran theology. The proclaimed God wills that all men be saved, inasmuch as by the word of his grace he comes alike to all who hear that word, so that it is the fault of a man's own will if he be lost, especially since "the Incarnate God came into the world that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer, for all men, all things that are necessary unto salvation"—an aphorism that lies very near the center of the Lutheran theology.

II. THE DOGMATIC AND CONFSSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE LUTHERAN THEOLOGY.

It may at once be confidently affirmed that Luther's doctrine of "the proclaimed God," of justification by faith alone, of the

* *Luther's Theology*, II, 290.

means of grace, forms the guiding lines of the Lutheran dogmatic and confessional theology to the exclusion of the Determinism and Predestinationism of the earlier Luther and Melanchthon. In other words, the Lutheran dogmatic and confessional theology is not formally characterized by the Double Predestination, but by that Christian Universalism that sincerely offers salvation to all men, and maintains that the atonement of Christ in its purpose and design extends to all men in such a way as to make the salvation of every hearer of the Gospel certain, provided he believes the Gospel and accepts Christ as his Saviour, which he is able to do through the ministry of the word and by the working of the Holy Spirit, who is active in that ministry.

That these affirmations are fully justified, the following facts and quotations will show :

1. In his *Commentary on Colossians* (1527) Melanchthon clearly abandons that doctrine of Determinism and Pedestinationism which had been expressed in the first edition of the *Loci*, and recognizes the freedom of the will on things appertaining to this life ; but he denies that the will has power to perform Christian righteousness.* The same position is taken by him in the Saxon Visitation Articles of the same year, which were heartily approved by Luther and Bugenhagen, and were officially employed in organizing the Lutheran Church in Saxony.

2. In the Augsburg Confession (1530) there is, as many persons suppose, a faint reminiscence of the earlier deterministic and predestinarian *usus loquendi* in the statement of Article V, that the Holy Ghost "worketh faith, where and when it pleaseth God in those that hear the Gospel." But in a letter to Brentz in 1531 Melanchthon states that he had purposely excluded from the Apology all reference to Predestination, and declares that Predestination follows faith.† From this time on one peculiarity of Melanchthon's teaching is that he rejects all abstract and philosophical theories in regard to God's will, and bases all his thoughts about salvation on the clear and distinct word of God. He rests Election on the mercy of God, affirms

* See Galle, *Characteristik Melanchthon's*, p. 274

† C. R., II, 546.

that the promises of the Gospel extend to all, and that reprobation results from unwillingness to believe the Gospel. Such teaching appears already in the Apology: "In courts of men law and obligation are certain, mercy is uncertain. In the presence of God the case is different. Mercy has the clear command of God. For the Gospel is itself the command which bids us believe that God pardons and saves on account of Christ, according to the text: God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world might be saved through him. He that believeth in him is not condemned. Hence whenever mercy is mentioned, it must be understood that faith is required. And this faith makes the difference between those who are to be saved and those who are to be damned; between the worthy and the unworthy."

3. But this line of thought is much more amply exhibited by Melancthon in his *Commentary on Romans* (1532). In commenting on the ninth chapter he says: "Here we must hold fast to the word of the Gospel in regard to gratuitous mercy. For this very purpose was the voice of the Gospel touching the gracious reconciliation on account of the Son revealed, viz., that it might meet the question of merit and save us in this hard struggle by asseverating that we certainly are received gratuitously on account of the Mediator and not on account of our own unworthiness. See evident proofs of this in Rom. IV, and Titus III.

"The question of particularity arises. Because when we hear that mercy is the cause of Election, and yet that few are elected, we are even more distressed, and wonder whether there is respect of persons with God, and why he does not have mercy on all. To such temptation ought to be opposed the universal promises of the Gospel, which teach that God for Christ's sake, and gratuitously, promises salvation to all, as is said: The righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ is to all and upon all. And again: The Lord of all is rich in mercy to all. Again: Whosoever calleth on the name of the Lord, etc. These universal statements must be opposed to the temptation in regard to particularity. Then it must be affirmed that in regard to the will of God we must not judge according

to reason without the word of God. As in Justification, so in Election, we must not judge according to reason, or according to the law, but according to the Gospel."* In this same connection he declares that the cause of reprobation is persistent opposition to God's call, and unwillingness to trust to the Gospel call, and is in the will.

4. (a). In the year 1535 Melanchthon issued a thoroughly rewritten edition of his *Loci*. In this book he declares that Predestination must be learned, not from the law, but from the Gospel, and that its cause is identical with that of Justification. Again and again does he say that the promise of the Gospel appertains to all men; that if any one should seek the cause of Election apart from the Gospel, he must necessarily err; that to particularize the Gospel is to make it uncertain; that God has mercy on all, and wishes all to be saved; that Christ is the cause of Election. He says: "Let us therefore seek the promise in which God expresses his will, and let us know that there is no will of God apart from the word; but the command of God is unchangeable, and let us hear the Son as he says: Hear ye him. This word embraces all the promises. Let it therefore be fixed in our minds, and let us always think of it in daily devotions that the command of God is eternal and unchangeable, that we may believe the promise of grace, which is the sum of the Gospel, as the prophets, Christ and the Apostles teach, as John 3:16; John 6:40: This is the voice of the Father that every one who believes in the Son, may have eternal life. In a word, this is the proper and perpetual voice of the Gospel. As the preaching appertains to all, and condemns all (Rom. 3), so also the promise of grace appertains to all." The universality of Predestination and the call is proved from such passages as Matt. 11:28; John 3:15; Rom. 3:22; 10:12; 11:22; Isa. 53:6; Acts 10:43; 13:39; 10:34.

(b). In 1543 Melanchthon published a still further revised edition of the *Loci*. He lays down three rules for the discussion of Election. He says: "The first is, we must not judge of Election from the reason, nor from the law, but from the Gospel.

"The second is that the whole number of those to be saved,

* C. R., XV, 678-687.

are elected on account of Christ. Wherefore unless we embrace the recognition of Christ we cannot speak of Election.

"The third is, that we do not seek one cause for Justification, and another for Election. Peter is elected because he is a member of Christ, that is, he pleases God because by faith he has been made a member of Christ. Therefore as when we speak of justification we begin with a recognition of the voice of the Gospel, so when we are about to speak of Election, let us embrace the voice of the Gospel. So must we judge; we must begin with the recognition of Christ and with the Gospel."

(c). In the *Loci* of 1559 (the last edition) Melanchthon repeats the above, word for word, reaffirms the universality of the call, and declares that the cause of Election is compassion in the will of God, and that "we must judge of Election *a posteriori*, viz., that without doubt those are elected who lay hold on the compassion promised on account of Christ, and persevere in faith to the end."

(d). In the *Catechesis Puerilis*, which, beginning in the year 1532, passed through numerous editions, Melanchthon says: "As the preaching of repentance appertains to all, so also the promise appertains to all. Let us not allow our faith to be shaken by unreasonable discussions about Predestination; but let us begin with the word of God, and let us remember that the promise appertains to all, and let us be assured that those things truly belong to us which God has set forth and promised in his word, because he acts through his word, and wishes to be found in his word, according to the passage: The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth."* To the same effect speaks Melanchthon in his *Explicatio Symboli Niceni*, completed in the year 1557, and first published after the author's death: "The promise appertains to all, and God's will of salvation must be learned from the divine word."†

(e). The significance of this teaching lies in the fact that it received the almost unqualified endorsement of the Lutheran Church. Melanchthon's *Loci* was the common theological

* C. R. XXIII : 179.

† *Ibid*, 347-584.

text-book. It was in the hands of all theologians, pastors and students. From 1535 to 1559 the *Loci* appeared in not less than forty-eight editions, some of them in German, but the most of them in Latin. In 1545 the *Loci* received Luther's endorsement in the following words: "There are now many systematic works extant. Among those Philip's *Loci Communes* excel. By means of these the theologian and pastor can be well instructed, and can be effective in preaching the Gospel."*

(f). And still more significant is Melanchthon's testimony, that in the *Loci* he "faithfully brought together the teaching of those churches which embraced the Confession delivered to the Emperor in 1530," and that he brought into "one body" the teaching of Luther scattered in many volumes, saying: "I always submitted all my writings to the judgment of our Church and of Luther himself. Also in regard to many subjects I carefully inquired of Luther for his opinion."†

It thus appears that the *Loci* were not an exhibition of the private opinions of Melanchthon, but such an exhibition of Lutheran teaching as received the indorsement of Luther himself.

(a). In 1533 Melanchthon issued a new German edition of the Augsburg Confession, which was republished again and again, always as the Confession that had been delivered to the Emperor in 1530, and which for more than a generation supplanted Melanchthon's German *Editio Princeps*, and which has never been objected to by any part of the Lutheran Church. In Article V, instead of "when and where he will," we have the following: "God has instituted the ministerial office to preach the Gospel, which announces the wrath of God against sin, and also offers the forgiveness of sins to all men, so that all who are alarmed at the wrath of God against their sin, and comfort themselves with the promise preached in the Gospel, and believe that with God there truly is forgiveness on account of Christ, and not on account of their own repentance, wor-

* Preface to first edition of Luther's works.

† Quoted in Baumgarten's *Glaubenslehre*, II, 153.

thiness or works, all these certainly have forgiveness of sins."*

(b). In 1540 Melanchthon was authorized to publish a new edition of the Confession in Latin. This edition was called *Confessio uberior*, *Confessio locupletior*, *Confessio emendata*, was approved by Luther, was by public authority employed in several diets as the Confession of the Lutheran faith that had been delivered to the Emperor in 1530,† and so completely did it supplant all earlier editions as to render the *Editio Princeps* almost a forgotten book. For at least twenty years it was emphatically the Confession of the Lutheran Church, and was not thought of as *variata* until after jealousy and calumny had aspersed the memory of its author.

In this "emended" Confession, in Article V, instead of: "Where and when it seemeth good to God," we have: "Christ instituted the office of teaching the Gospel, which teaches repentance and remission of sins; and each kind of preaching is for all, condemns the sins of all, and promises remission of sins to all, so that the promise may not be uncertain, but that all minds terrified may know that they ought to believe that remission of sins is certainly bestowed on us for the sake of Christ, and not on account of our merits and worthiness."‡

(c). In the year 1551 Melanchthon, by command of his Elector, prepared *The Confession of the Doctrine of the Saxon Churches*, commonly known as the *Confessio Saxonica*, to be presented to the Council of Trent. The author "wishes simply and faithfully to recite and to repeat the doctrine of the Confession which was presented to the Emperor, Charles V, at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530." The document was signed by the Professors of Wittenberg and Leipzig, and by Superintendents and pastors of Saxony, by the Legates of the Margrave of Brandenburg, by the Legates of Count Gebhard of Mansfeld, by the ministers of Strassburg, the ministers of Hither Pomerania and by others, "as the common doctrine taught in our churches and universities."

* C. R., XXI : 728.

† See facsimiles of title pages in C. R., XXVI : 343.

‡ C. R., XXVII : 327 *et seqq.*

In this Confession there is not a word that favors the doctrine of Predestination. On the contrary the universality of the offer of salvation is presented in the clearest form: "It is most certain that the preaching of repentance appertains to all men: So also the promise appertains to all, and offers the promise of pardon to all, as is said in those passages that refer to all: Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Also John 3: That everyone who believes on him might not perish. Rom. 10: Whosoever believeth on him shall not be confounded. Also: The Lord of all is rich towards all who call on him. Rom. 2: God hath concluded all under disobedience, that he might have mercy on all. Let every individual include himself in this universal promise, and not indulge distrust, but strive to assent to the word of God, obey the Holy Spirit, and seek assistance, according to Luke 2: "How much more will he give the Spirit to them that ask him?"

(d). In the year 1552 Melanchthon composed the *Examen Ordinandum*, which was incorporated in numerous *Kirchenordnungen* and widely used in the examination of candidates for the Lutheran ministry. In its doctrinal teaching this *Examen* excludes every thought of Predestination except as the same depends upon faith in Christ. It says: "The rule must be held without exception: We must judge of the will of God by this word. The word condemns all without exception who do not turn unto God, as is said in 1 Cor. 6: Do not err: Idolaters, murderers, adulterers are not heirs of eternal life. Likewise, if anyone believe not on the Son the wrath of God abides upon him. On the contrary God receives all without exception, who by conversion and repentance believe on the Son according to the passages: As I live saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the sinner, but that he turn and live. Likewise, God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life. Let these two rules, which throw light on all other doctrines, be ever kept in view." Here it appears that the doctrine of repentance and the offer of salvation to all men, is to be held as regulative for the entire

system of Christian truth. Those passages of Scripture are quoted which call all men to salvation. In the very language of Melancthon, both the command to repentance and the call to faith embrace *omnes universaliter*.

(e). In 1552 the *Confessio Wirtembergica* was prepared by John Brentz at the command of Duke Christopher. It also was designed to be sent and was sent to Trent, and is written very much in the strain of the *Confessio Saxonica*. It contains not one word in exposition or defense of Predestination. Brentz did indeed in some of his other writings show some remnants of Luther's earlier predestinarianism. But in this Confession he again and again uses the *propter Christum*, and not the *per Christum*, and more and more did he advance with the Lutheran tendency, as we shall hereafter see. Flacius, Amsdorf, and a few others, chiefly out of jealousy and hate of Melancthon, retained a larger proportion of the earlier Lutheran Predestinarianism. But that they were not in the true line of Lutheran development on this subject, is shown by the fact that their views were not admitted into the Form of Concord.

If now we bring together the facts, we find that after the year 1530 the Determinism of Melancthon, as it appeared in the first edition of his *Loci*, and of Luther as it appeared in his *De Servo Arbitrio* in connection with "the hidden God," and their consequent Predestinarianism, disappeared entirely from the greater part of the earlier dogmatic, and the last remnant of it from all the confessional, teaching of the Lutheran Church. Again, the most influential dogmatic teaching of the Lutheran Church had been compiled, as Melancthon declares, from Luther's "numerous volumes," and Luther himself had placed his *imprimatur* on Melancthon's *corpus*. It was found in 1551 that the two most influential universities, many superintendents and representatives of national Churches, could state their views confessionally, not only by omitting Predestination, but by affirming that the promise and intention of the Gospel embraces all men *propter Christum*, and that the will of God touching man's salvation must be learned from the Gospel. They had

thus made a practical application of Luther's proclamation that "the Incarnate God had come into the world that he might will, might speak, might do, might suffer, might offer, for all men all things that are necessary unto salvation," and of his other proclamation, viz.: that "inasmuch as the word of God comes to all, it is the fault of the human *voluntas*, which does not admit him."

These principles, together with Justification by faith, and the view that God is active in the means of grace, had entered genetically and constructively into the Lutheran teaching from the very beginning. Now by the middle of the sixteenth century they had driven the earlier Predestinarianism completely into the background, and for the simple reason that this last had never entered genetically and constructively into Lutheranism, but had been used as an auxiliary to support the doctrine of the bondage of the will. Moreover, it could not logically consist with the doctrine of "the proclaimed God," of the design of the atonement, and with the view of the means of grace, expressed even in the *De Servo Arbitrio*. Melanchthon had declared that the propositions *de Praedestinatione, sue de Electione*, are to be avoided; and the phrases, *propter Christum, gratis propter Mediatorem*, and their equivalents, appear thousands and thousands of times in the writings of Luther, Melanchthon, Brentz and others. Predestination where taught at all mostly followed the order given in Luther's Preface to the Romans, and the universality of the call and of the promise of grace, had become marked features of the Lutheran teaching, while Melanchthon had compared the Geneva teaching to the Stoic necessity, and Calvin to Zeno.* There were exceptions, but the exceptions were against the fundamental principles, and against the tendency, and served to illustrate, not to disprove, the rule. The Lutheran Church had not followed Luther, and did not follow him in the doctrine of Predestination as set forth in the *De Servo Arbitrio*.

* C. R., VII, 932.

III. SWITZERLAND.

But how was it in Switzerland? The Zwinglian doctrine of Predestination, which affirms that "election precedes faith," and "faith is the seal of Election," remained at Zurich, and was taken up by Henry Bullinger, "who preserved and completed the work of his predecessor, and exerted, by his example and writings, a commanding influence throughout the Reformed Church inferior only to that of Calvin."* In 1555 he was joined by Peter Martyr, who had taught at Strassburg, and who was a most orthodox Zwinglio-Calvinist, as his *Loci Communes*, now lying before us, do show, for in this book we have the Double Predestination—Election and Reprobation—done to perfection.†

Moreover, in 1549 the *Consensus Tigurinus*, composed by Calvin, had united Zurich and Geneva, not only in the doctrine of the sacraments, but also in the doctrine of Predestination, for its Article XVI reads as follows: "In addition we sedulously teach that God does not promiscuously exert his power in all who receive the sacraments: but only in the elect. For as he illumines to faith only those whom he has foreordained to life, so he accomplishes by the secret power of his Spirit that the elect receive what the sacraments offer."‡

This Consensus was adopted by Zurich, St. Gall, Schaffhausen, the Grisons, Neuchatel, and, after some hesitation, by Basel. Thus the union of the Swiss Protestant Churches was practically completed by the adoption of a formula in which Calvinism prevailed. Hence it is well said that "the dogma of predestination consolidated the Calvinistic creed."§

Zwinglio-Calvinism now, that is, from about the middle of the sixteenth century, ruled Switzerland and brought peace and harmony to its churches, though some of the Swiss did not relish the extreme development of Predestination exhibited in the

* *Creeds of Christendom*, I, 391.

† *Classis Tertia*, pp. 443 et seqq.

‡ Miller's *Bekennnisschriften der Reformirten Kirche*, p. 161.

§ *Creeds of Christendom*, I, 477.

Consensus Genevensis. Calvinism also made advances into Germany, as at Lindau, Ulm, Strassburg (where Calvin had lived and taught for three years), into the Palatinate and into Hesse. It was a powerful system, and was bound together by the bands of an inexorable logic.

IV. THE CONFLICT.

Enough has been said in the current volume of the *QUARTERLY* to show that Lutheranism and Calvinism are two different theologies. The former places Justification by faith at the center, and regards it as the living source from which all other doctrines spring. The means of grace are regarded as real bearers of grace, in which God himself is active. The atonement embraces in its purpose and destination all men. The promise of grace is directed alike to all who hear the gospel, and becomes effective in all who believe. The will of God respecting the salvation of men must be learned alone from the divine word. "They are elected and please God who diligently hear the Gospel, believe on Christ, prove their faith by good works, and suffer what they shall be called on to suffer."*

"The Calvinistic doctrine is this, that God from eternity chose or elected some men, certain definite individuals of the human race, to everlasting life—that he determined certainly and infallibly to bring these persons to salvation by a Redeemer, that in making this selection of some men and on resolving to save them, he was not influenced by anything existing in them, or foreseen in them, by which they were distinguished from other men, or by any reason known to or comprehensible by us, but only by his sovereign good pleasure, by the counsel of his own will—and that this eternal decree or purpose he certainly and infallibly executes in time in regard to each and every one included under it. This is the Calvinistic doctrine of election; every Calvinist believes this, and every one who believes this is a Calvinist."† In addition to this description

* *Erl. Ed.*, 1: 106.

† *The Reformers and the Theology of the Reformation.* By Principal Cunningham, p. 434.

we may say that Calvinism makes Reprobation just as prominent as it does Election, puts faith after Election, makes Justification a symbol of Election, and distinguishes between an effectual and an ineffectual call.

Theologies that are thus different from each other at the very heart and center, must sooner or later come into conflict with each other at the deepest point of difference. Any disturbance on the periphery is only a sign of internal disharmony, as the sacramentarian controversy was only a sign of diverse ways of conceiving the two fundamental—formal and material—principles of the Reformation. That the conflict between Zwinglio-Calvinism and Lutheranism at the deepest center did not break out earlier is due to the common opposition to Rome, to the Sacramentarian War, and to the remnants of the earlier Lutheran Predestinarianism that still lingered in Flacius, Amsdorf, Heerbrand and others. But just so soon as Lutherans saw that the absolute Predestination was not necessary to guard the center, and that its own doctrine of the appropriation of salvation could not exist side by side with the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, and that the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination and its consequences had entered genetically into the Creeds that proceeded from Calvin's hand, and were shaping the worship and discipline of the Zwinglio-Calvinistic churches—just so soon the conflict came, and it came exactly at that place where the two theologies met in church and school, namely, at Strassburg, where Lutheranism was represented by John Marbach, superintendent and professor of theology, and by numerous clergy; and where Zwinglio-Calvinism was represented by Jerome Zanchius, Calvinistic professor of theology, and by John Sturm, rector of the University, who was a Zwinglio-Calvinist, and by others.* In February, 1561, Zanchius, in lecturing on 1 John 2: 19, declared that "those, who went out from us," must be looked upon as antichrists,

* Our account of the Strassburg Controversy is compiled from Loescher's *Historia Motuum*, Schweizer's *Centraldogmen*, I, 418 *et seqq.*, and from *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1859, pp. 643 *et seqq.* These works reproduce many of the original documents.

and that those who abide in the fellowship of Christ are the elect and that "there are many in the Church outwardly, who do not belong to it. These are the reprobate. The saints who are not only through the covenant of eternal election, but also through that of the Holy Ghost, united with Christ and are inserted in his body, the Church, persevere unceasingly in faith, and cannot fall away." Marbach said that such a doctrine of the perseverance of the saints and of the inamissibleness of grace rests upon the eternal decree of election. He did not deny that the Bible teaches a doctrine of Predestination, but he preferred to begin with faith in Christ. Here was the real point of difference. Zanchius proceeded by the *a priori* method; Marbach by the *a posteriori* method. For the conference that was arranged between them, Marbach prepared the following as one of his theses: "He (Zanchius) in regard to salvation and the decree of God should not go out *a priori*, that is, from the secret eternal predestination of God, but should conduct his hearers to the revealed will of God, namely, to the Bible, or to the ministry of the Church instituted by Christ, or as Paul says, to the call. Rom. 8 : 29." This, it is hardly necessary to say, is the true Lutheran position. One of Zanchius's theses *de Prædestinatione* reads as follows: "The number of those elected to eternal life, and the number of the Reprobate, is in each case fixed with God. As those elected to life can never be lost and consequently are necessarily saved, so those who are not predestinated to life, cannot be saved, and hence are necessarily damned. He who has once been elected, cannot be reprobated." This, it will be seen, is unqualifiedly Calvinistic. Agreement between Lutherans and Calvinists on the basis of such a thesis would not be possible. The conference that ensued was an occasion of bitter personal recriminations, and served only to widen the chasm between the two parties. The theses of Zanchius were very offensive to the Lutherans, especially so the fourteenth: "If when Paul says (1 Tim. 2 : 4) God will have all men to be saved, the word 'all' be referred only to the elect, and if 1 John, 2 : 2 : Christ is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world, be understood only in ref-

erence to the elect scattered throughout the world, such an explanation is not contrary to Holy Scripture."

Zanchius felt the difficulty of the situation, and in August went to Marburg, whence he brought an *Opinion* that expresses full approval of his theses. A little later he went to Heidelberg, and obtained from the theologians there a similar *Opinion* of unqualified approval. He also went to Zurich and Schaffhausen and obtained an *Opinion* at each place that approves his theses and contains the full Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination. That is, the theologians of these four influential centers placed themselves squarely on the Calvinistic fundamental basis.*

Zanchius went also to Stuttgart, to see Brentz, who (Zanchius reports) approved some of the theses, and rejected others; but later Brentz wrote to Marbach that he had rejected all of them, declared that the doctrine of Predestination presented nakedly and absolutely, profaned, rather than clarified, the mystery, and said that Zanchius's doctrine of the perseverance of the saints is nonsense. From Stuttgart Zanchius went to Tübingen, where Vergerius, with whom he stayed, invited the theologians to meet him at dinner. But they did not come. Then Zanchius visited them in their colleges. They approved (so says Zanchius) all the theses except those on the inamissibility of grace.

The lines were now distinctly drawn. Four ecclesiastical centers, two of them in Germany, and two in German Switzerland, had placed themselves unmistakably on the side of the rigid Calvinistic Predestinarianism; and positions were offered to Zanchius at Marburg, Heidelberg, Berne and Zurich. Basel had counseled moderation. But John Brentz, the most influential theologian in Würtemberg, and Tübingen on the point centrally in dispute at that time, had placed themselves on the Lutheran foundation.

This division of sentiment abroad only aggravated the strife at Strassburg. Finally it was decided to place the matter in

* The *Opinions* are given by Schweizer, *Centraldogmen*, I, 449 et seqq.

the hands of arbitrators to be called from Württemberg, Zweibrücken and "the half-Lutheran Basle." In February, 1563, these assembled at Strassburg—four theologians, viz.: Andreae, of Tübingen, Flinsbach, superintendent of Zweibrücken, Sulzer and Köchlin, of Basle, and two civil counselors from Zweibrücken. In March these arbitrators agreed on a *Consensus*,* which, as the Lord's Supper had figured, though only secondarily, in the strife, contained two paragraphs on the Lord's Supper and twenty on Predestination. It was agreed that in reference to the Lord's Supper the teaching should be in accordance with the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, as subscribed at Naumburg, and that all should follow the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. It is not said that the body and blood of Christ are present *in, with* and *under*, but only *with*, the bread and wine, and nothing is said about the eating of the godless. In regard to Predestination it is said that Predestination pertains to the elect, that the promises are universal, and exclude *no* one, that all are alike called to salvation, that "grace is offered *universaliter omnibus*," that we must begin with the written word, that Predestination is useful as a foil against Free-will and as a comfort to distressed consciences. In a word the *Consensus*, though lacking in definiteness, is prevailingly Lutheran. A few years later it was used by Andreae in composing Article XI of the Form of Concord.

March 18th the *Consensus* was subscribed by thirty-seven persons—by Zanchius as follows: Hanc doctrinae formulam ut piam agnosco, ita eam recipio ego Ieronimus Zanchius. This subscription was given under "protest," and with the explanation that it was made "conditionaliter:" "that I might be allowed to explain the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Articles of Concord, as well as these present articles, according to the will of God's word, the doctrine of Augustine, Luther and Bucer."†

This manner of subscription on the part of Zanchius gave offense to both sides. The Lutherans charged him with in-

* Given by Loescher, *Ibid.* *Anderer Theil*, 229 *et seqq.*

† *Zurich Letters* (Second Series), pp. 98 *et seqq.*, and pp. 60 *et seqq.*

sincerity; the Calvinists, with the lack of steadfastness. Bullinger counselled him to regain his freedom of teaching, or to leave Strassburg, and Calvin exhorted him to stand by his "protest," and not to suffer himself to be led by the ambiguity of his subscription to ambiguity in teaching. Soon he left Strassburg, and, after wandering from place to place, was called in 1568 to the Heidelberg University, where in harmony with his colleagues he taught a rigid predestinarianism. He died in 1590.

The lines were now more sharply drawn than before. All Protestant Switzerland (with the exception, for a while, of the half-Lutheran Basle), Heidelberg and Marburg, stood emphatically on the Calvinistic side. Strassburg and Tübingen had declared for the true Lutheran tradition.

In these late contests the Lord's Supper had played only a subordinate part.* The real cause of the schism between the two theologies of the Reformation, was the doctrine of the Double Predestination, which had never had a determinative place and relation in the Lutheran theology, but which from the beginning had had exactly such a place and relation in the Zwinglio-Calvinistic theology.† Henceforth, that

* For the Marbach-Zanchius Conference (1561), noted above, Marbach had prepared the following thesis on the Lord's Supper: "On the Lord's Supper he should teach in harmony with us according to the form of the Augsburg Confession. Since he conceives of the mode of Christ's presence otherwise than we, for the sake of peace he should keep silent on this point and leave the explanation of that to us." In Zanchius's fourteen theses prepared for the same conference, and afterwards carried by him to the Universities (see above), there is absolutely no reference to the Lord's Supper. He tells us that in an interview with Andreae at Strassburg during the sessions of the arbitrators, after explaining his doctrine of the Supper, Andreae exclaimed: "Truly then you hold the same opinion as we do;" and again, after further exchange of views on the subject: "Well, we have said enough upon the Supper. We thank God that in this article respecting the Supper there is no great difference among you, since you admit on both sides a real and substantial presence." *Zurich Letters* (second series), p. 101. These facts show that the chief ground of dispute was not the Lord's Supper, but Predestination and its consequences.

† Very properly does Schweizer say: "Now this is the real difference.

is, from about the year 1560, each of these theologies came more and more to understand itself better in its innermost center, as the disciples had begun consistently to develop and to apply the principles of their masters. Gradually there was developed a distinctly Lutheran doctrine of Predestination, which later received confessional statement in the Form of Concord, and was elaborated by the dogmaticians; while the Zwinglio-Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, which had been seminally and principally enunciated by Zwingli, and had been developed dogmatically by Calvin, entered confessionally into the second Helvetic Confession, into the Heidelberg Catechism, and still more distinctly into some of the later Calvinistic Creeds.

V. THE REFORMED CONFESSIONS.

1. *The Second Helvetic Confession.*

J. J. Hottinger calls the Zurich *Opinion* for Zanchius a *brief confession on Predestination*. Schweitzer says "that Calvin would have given a great deal to have had such a confession from Zurich against Balzac ten years earlier. Such was the faith exactly at this time, and immediately thereafter the Second Helvetic Confession was drawn up at Zurich. The faith of the Zurichers was, as a matter of course, the same in both documents, but a confession for congregations and a more exact one for exact theological controversies require different statements. It would be perverse to conclude from the Helvetic Confession that its authors did not believe what it says in an unscholastic way. Manifestly Martyr's influence had wrought specially to bring the Zurichers to such a point. How could we imagine it otherwise? When one has conceded what Bullinger had already conceded, a more logical mind, provided there be no

In the Zwinglio-Calvinistic system Predestination is in its very self a *weighty doctrine*, according to which others are adjusted; yea, as Martyr, Beza and others say, the chief part of Christian doctrine. But in the Lutheran (system) it becomes *merely an auxiliary dogma* for other more important central doctrines. Not so much the dogma itself as its position and significance are disputed" (I, 445).

special disinclination, easily shows the necessity of the full Calvinistic doctrine."*

This Confession, in its essential features, was composed by Bullinger in 1562. In 1565 Beza proposed a common confession for the Swiss churches, and joined in conferences with others at Berne and Zurich to produce such a confession.† Bullinger's Confession was revised at these conferences and accepted to become the common confession of all the churches of Helvetia, and was approved by Zurich, Geneva, Berne, Schaffhausen, Biel, the Grisons, St. Gall, Mühlhausen, and later by Basel. It thus, as a matter of fact, became the bond of union among the churches in Switzerland, which, as we have seen, had become distinctly Calvinistic.‡ The heading of the Tenth Article is: *Of God's Predestination, and of the Election of the Saints*. The Article reads as follows: "God from eternity predestined or elected freely and of pure grace, without any respect of men, the saints whom he wished to save in Christ, according to the word of the Apostle (Eph. 1:4): God chose us in him before the foundations of the world were laid. And again: Who hath saved us and called us with a holy calling, not ac-

* *Centraldogmen*, I, 459.

† The title of the Second Helvetic Confession as given in the original edition, printed at Zurich in 1566, is as follows: *Confessio et Expositio simplex orthodoxae fidei, et dogmatum Catholicorum syncerae religionis Christianae, concorditer ab Ecclesiae Christi ministris, qui sunt in Helvetia, Tiguri, Bernae, Schaffhusii, Sangalli, Curiae Rhetorum et apud confederatos, Mylhussii item, et Bienne, quibus adjunxerunt se et Genevensis Ecclesiae ministri, edita in hoc, ut universis testentur fidelibus quod in unitate verae et antiquae Christi Ecclesiae perstent, neque ulla nova aut erronea dogmata spargant, atque idio etiam nihil consortii cum ullis Sectis aut haeresibus habeant: hoc demum vulgata tempore, qui de ea aestimare piis omnibus liceat.*

‡ Ersch und Gruber, *Allg. Encyc. in loco*. The particulars of this movement for a common Reformed Confession are given by J. J. Hottinger in his *Helvetische Kirchengeschichte, Dritter Theil*, pp. 894-6. The movement embraced the Reformed churches of Switzerland, Scotland, Poland, Hungary, France and Neuberg. The primary object was to refute the calumnies of the Papists and others. According to Hottinger *ubi supra* it was the churches of the Swiss Confederation and of Geneva, which first moved in the direction of having a common confession.

according to our works, but according to his purpose and grace which he hath given unto us through Jesus Christ before times eternal (2 Tim. 1: 8, 9)." In true Calvinistic style the Article speaks also of the Reprobate, of the small number of the saved, of the end of Election, as the glorification of God's grace, and says that the grace of free election and predestination and their salutary admonition and doctrines must be preached.*

When we recall the rigid predestinarianism of Bullinger, Beza and Peter Martyr, "who fully consented to this confession, shortly before his death,"† and recall the rigid predestinarianism of the Zurichers, as expressed in their *Opinion* for Zanchius in 1561, and recall the fact that Zanchius was invited in 1563 to be Martyr's successor at Zurich—recalling these facts it would be absurd to inquire whether this Confession was intended to set forth the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination.

Bullinger declared that the Confession "agrees with all those who in various places through all the believing churches of Germany, France, England, and other kingdoms and countries, profess Christ with sincere faith."‡ Though at first intended to be a private confession, and then a common confession for Switzerland, it soon came into larger prominence. Frederick III, of the Palatinate, who had been scandalized by the Hesshuss-Klebitz fight over the communion cup, had for years shown strong Zwinglio-Calvinistic inclinations and had become a Calvinist. He wrote to the Strassburg Magistracy in behalf of Zanchius, and invited the latter to his University; had sustained the Heidelberg theologians in their rigidly Calvinistic *Opinion* for Zanchius; had in 1563 given his electoral permission to the publication at Heidelberg of a German translation of the Catechism, Confession and Liturgy of the French churches, "which," says Henry Alting, "are the basis and foundation of the Palatinate Church, and the bonds of its union with the French, the Swiss and the Belgic churches."§ Now, late in 1565, Frederick, in view of the approaching Diet (1566) of Augsburg, where

* Müller, *Bekennnisschriften der Reformirten Kirche*, pp. 181-2.

† *Creds of Christendom*, I, 392.

‡ Müller, XXI. § *Historia Eccle. Palatinae*, pp. 191-2.

he expected to be called to account for his departure from Lutheranism, sought advice from Geneva and Zurich, and requested from Bullinger the confession that was to express the unity of so many churches in Switzerland, France and Germany.* "In all these negotiations," says Professor Müller, "there echoes the purpose to demonstrate to the Elector that his faith is by no means sectarian, but is shared by evangelical Christians in Switzerland, France, the Netherlands, and England. A common confession of all these churches is spoken of as a matter of course. Bullinger was now in the fortunate position, at the beginning of December, 1565, of being able, upon request of the Elector, immediately to send, with a lengthy *Opinion*, his confession, which had long been prepared."† January 6th, 1566, the Electoral Chancellor answered Bullinger in a letter full of enthusiasm. "In order to introduce a great common act of all the Reformed, this Confession was ordered to be translated and printed in German in Heidelberg, while the Zurichers were to publish the Latin text. Meanwhile this had been anticipated by the Swiss theologians, who immediately enlisted in the movement all the evangelical localities in their own land. In a short time these—with the exception of the Lutherizing Basel—all declared their approval."‡ Armed with six Latin and six German copies of the Confession the Elector, "on the twenty-fifth of March, 1566, encouraged by the unanimity of the Swiss faith, could enter on the journey to Augsburg."§ But more. By the adoption of this Confession the Elector, according to the recognized principle: *Cujus regio, ejus religio*, imposed the Zwinglio-Calvinistic faith upon the churches of his dominions, and made them Zwinglio-Calvinistic churches, and allied them confessionally with the whole group of the so-called Reformed Churches. For even a Scotch Synod at the instance of Beza, September 4th, 1566, after "diligently examining and exploring everything, felt compelled by their consciences and

* Ersch und Gruber, *ut Supra*.

† *Ibid.*, XXI-II.

‡ *Ibid.*, XXII.

§ Müller, *Ibid.*

by their sense of duty, to express not only their approval, but also their exceeding commendation, of every chapter and every sentence,"* and subscribed it and affixed the seal of the University of St. Andrews. On February 4th, 1567, it was adopted by the Hungarian Church, and later by the Bohemian, Polish and Holland churches. Very properly then does Dr. Karl Müller say: "Abroad and at home Bullinger's Confession, which in a mild manner fused together the ideas of Zwingli and Calvin, presented a strong bond of union between the Reformed." And very correctly does Schaff say: "The Helvetic Confession is the most widely adopted, and hence the most authoritative of all the Continental Reformed symbols, with the exception of the Heidelberg Catechism."† Hence the body that adopts this Confession, makes, marks and defines itself as Calvinistic, as over against both the Catholic and the Lutheran Church, as any confession might be supposed to do, which had Henry Bullinger as its author, Peter Martyr as its approver, and Theodore Beza as its endorser, translator and patron, for already in 1566 a French translation executed by Beza and Senebier appeared at Geneva; and Beza was especially active in urging this Confession upon foreign Churches. Dr. Shedd not only classes it with the "Calvinistic Confessions," but says: "It enunciates the strictly Calvinistic view of the sacraments in opposition to the Lutheran view, and maintains the Calvinistic theory of Predestination, and represents the theology of that great division of Protestantism which received its first formation under the guidance of Zwingli and the Swiss theologians, and was completed under that of Calvin, and his coadjutors."‡

2. *The Heidelberg Catechism.*

This book of popular instruction was composed in 1562. Its chief author was Zacharias Ursinus, who completed his

* See the long letter to Beza with the signatures of forty professors, superintendents and ministers, among the *Zurich Letters*, 1558-1602. *Second Series*, pp. 263-5.

† *Creeds*, I, 394.

‡ *Hist. Christ. Doctrine*, II, 469.

theological studies under the influence of Calvin, Beza, Bullinger and Martyr, "and was thoroughly initiated into the Reformed Creed."* Casper Olevianus, who shared the responsibility of authorship, had received his theological education at Zurich, Geneva and Lausanne, and had assisted in composing the Heidelberg *Opinion* for Zanchius. That they were out-and-out Calvinists is shown conclusively by the chief events in their lives, and by their theological works. Ursinus, after his dismission from his native city, went to Zurich, and spent the Winter of 1560-1 in pursuing theological studies under Peter Martyr, whence, the next Summer, on recommendation of Martyr, he followed a call to Heidelberg to become professor of systematic theology. In the year 1562, just while the Marbach-Zanchius controversy was raging at Strassburg, he and Olevianus, under commission of the Elector Frederick III, composed the Heidelberg Catechism.

The influences that prevailed at Heidelberg at that time were altogether Zwinglio-Calvinistic. So far as the University was concerned, it had committed itself to Calvinism in the *Opinion* for Zanchius. Olevianus, the Court preacher, was unqualifiedly Calvinistic, and Erastus, the Court physician, was an ardent Zwinglian, as was also Ehem, the Chancellor. Under the influences that surrounded his Court, and forced along by events, Frederick had broken away from Lutheranism, and had become a Calvinist, or was strongly tending to Calvinism.

On this last point the testimony of the old Reformed historians is decisive. Hospinian in his History of the Sacramentarian Controversy, p. 264, writes: "A general reformation of the University and of the churches of the Palatinate having been resolved upon, Frederick called orthodox ministers, teachers, and professors from various quarters, and dismissed those who held different views.† Also in the following year,

* Schaff, *Creeds* I, 566. The Tercentenary Edition of the Heidelberg Catechism, p. 30, says that Ursinus "surrendered himself to Peter Martyr as his theological guide and instructor."

† "The decree by which the Palatinate was purged of Lutheranism appeared immediately after that disputation, namely August 12th, 1560.

June 3d and 4th, in a public disputation he defended the orthodox faith and satisfied all in regard to his change of religious views." That by "orthodox" Hospinian means Zwinglians and Calvinists, is evident from the title of his book. And Diestius in his *De Lite Religiosa*, p. 124, says: "Frederick III reformed religion in his dominions according to the sentiment of Melanchthon and of Calvin."* To this must be added the testimony of contemporary Lutherans: Under the date of September 9th, 1563, John Brentz, in an official *Opinion* to Duke Christopher, says that a council of electoral and princely delegates just held in Heidelberg had "unqualifiedly subscribed the French and English Confessions," and that "it is notorious that Calvinism reigns in England and in the Palatinate." Three days later Duke Christopher in acknowledging the receipt of the resolutions of said Heidelberg council reminds Palsgraf Wolfgang that while France and England had agreed with Württemberg against the papacy, "as regards the articles of the Lord's Supper, Predestination, Free-Will and some other things, we could not indeed agree with the French churches."† But the Palatinate had now officially endorsed the French Protestant Confession, which in essentials is the work of Calvin. More-

Also the theological faculty was henceforth to be filled with men of the Reformed Confession." Sudhoff, *Olevianus und Ursinus*, p. 79.

* Modern Reformed Historians affirm that Frederick's conversion to Calvinism took place before the composition of the Heidelberg Catechism: Klüpfel in Herzog's IV, p. 690: "The religious conference which was held at Heidelberg in 1560 at the instance of his sons-in-law, completed his conversion to Calvinism." Good, *Origin of the Ref. Ch. in Germany*, p. 147, referring to the same conference says: "This conference settled Frederick's mind in favor of Calvinism." Ullman, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1863, p. 637: "After the Naumburg Convention of 1561 he (Frederick) inclined more and more to the Reformed side. To this his own inner development may have contributed, as the preponderating influence of the Reformed theologians, with whom he had surrounded himself, had more attractive power for him than the harsh Lutherans. * * * Upon the whole his standpoint can be designated as that of a mild Calvinism mediated through Melanchthon." See also *Tercentenary Edition of the Heidelberg Catechism*, pp. 22-3.

† See Original documents in Pressel's *Anecdota Brentiana*, pp. 505-510.

over, much Calvinism had been brought into the Palatinate by the French and Dutch Protestant refugees.

Under the circumstances that clearly prevailed at Heidelberg and in the Palatinate generally by the middle of the year 1561, Frederick, feeling that he "must satisfy his own conscience, and consult for the salvation of his subjects," would naturally desire a confession and a book of popular instruction that should express his own faith, the faith of his theologians, and the faith of his people, and that might, as he says in the preface to his Catechism, correct the things in his dominions that were corrupt and depraved. A book prepared under the given conditions and for the purpose expressed, would be Calvinistic, and could be only Calvinistic. It would not have been morally possible for the authors to have composed a catechism or a confession of faith, that was not Calvinistic. A Calvinistic Catechism was required of them by the necessities of the situation, as well as by their own well-known theological convictions; and it is in line with a purpose to compose such a catechism that they made use of the catechisms of Bullinger, Lasky, and Calvin. Consequently the whole Catechism moves in an atmosphere of Calvinism, and many of its answers are charged with the *usus loquendi* of Calvinism, and, interpreted by the other writings of its authors, can be understood only in a Calvinistic sense. Hence the Heidelberg Catechism has always been catalogued with the undisputed Calvinistic confessions, has been endorsed by more Calvinistic synods than any other Reformed catechism in the world, and has been used in connection with the most rigidly Calvinistic confessions of faith.

But as a book designed chiefly for popular instruction, and having a conciliatory aim, we should expect that it would avoid the metaphysical subtleties of Calvinism, just as Calvin's own Catechism does. Very properly, therefore, does Schaff say: "The Calvinistic system is herein set forth with wise moderation, and without the sharp angular points."* Dr. Van Oosterzee declares that "the Dogmatics of the Reformed Church obtained

* Creeds, I, 540.

a preponderating Calvinistic character. * * * Calvin's doctrine of predestination, and not last in the Heidelberg Catechism, though here it has a thoroughly practical tendency."*

In December, 1562, the Catechism was approved by a synod assembled at Heidelberg, and a month later was ordered to be introduced into the Palatinate churches. Says Dr. Nevin: "The Catechism was fully enthroned in the Palatinate, from the beginning, as the rule and measure of the public faith. It was made the basis of theological instruction in the University. It was introduced into all the churches and schools, under the regulation which required the whole of it to be gone over in course in the way of familiar repetition and explanation, once every year."† Ursinus lectured on the Catechism until the year 1577. In 1591 his *Lectures* on the Catechism were published by David Paraeus. Says Dr. Nevin again: "The Heidelberg Catechism has been honored with an almost countless number of commentaries of later date; but this first one, derived from Ursinus himself through David Paraeus, has been generally allowed to be the best that has been written. No other, at all events, can have the same weight as an exposition of its true meaning." It is to this exposition, then, that we now turn in order to ascertain the "true meaning" of the Heidelberg Catechism.

Under the heading, *Of the Eternal Predestination of God*, Ursinus says: "The common place of the eternal election and reprobation naturally grows out of the doctrine of the Church: and it is for this reason correctly connected with it" (p. 393). Here we have the Double Predestination in true Calvinistic style. Immediately following, the author says: "In discussing this subject we must inquire principally: I. Is there any predestination? II. What is it? III. What is the cause of it? IV. What are the effects of it? V. Is it unchangeable? VI. To what extent may it be known? VII. Are the Elect always members of the Church, and the reprobate never? VIII. Can

* *Christ. Dogmatics*, I, 37.

† *Introduction* to Williard's Translation of Ursinus's *Lectures on the Heid. Cat.*

the Elect fall from the Church, and may the Elect always remain in it? IX. What is the use of the doctrine?"

In answer to the first question it is said: "Election is the eternal counsel of God. That there is such a thing as Predestination or Election is proved by these declarations of Scripture." Here follow quotations of Scripture. It is denied that "the promise of grace is universal." "It is declared that God wills that some men should not be saved." "God does not will the salvation of all as respects the efficacy of the call." The sufficiency of Christ's ransom is acknowledged, "but God has not obligated himself to apply it to all." In answer to the second question it is said that Predestination embraces two parts, "*Election and Reprobation*. *Election*, is the eternal and unchangeable decree of God, by which he has gratuitously decreed to convert some to Christ, to preserve them in faith and repentance, and through him to bestow upon them eternal life. *Reprobation* is the eternal and unchangeable purpose of God whereby he has decreed in his most just judgment to leave some in their sins," etc. All other questions are answered in harmony with the above affirmations. Both Election and Reprobation have their cause in "the good pleasure of God, which is most free." The effects of Predestination comprehend "the entire work of our salvation," as well as the creation and blinding of the Reprobate and "their banishment into everlasting punishment." It is decreed that "Predestination is fixed and unchangeable." Taken as a whole we must say that in our reading in Calvinistic theology—Calvin, Martyr, Beza, Turretine, Mastricht, Venema *et al*—we have not found ten consecutive pages that set forth the Calvinistic doctrine of the Double Predestination more distinctively than do pp. 293-303 of Ursinus's *Lectures* on his own Catechism. The doctrine is there with all its antithetical sharpness, and with answers to current objections. Such, according to Dr. Nevin, is the "true meaning" of the Heidelberg Catechism. To intimate that Ursinus read this Double Predestination *into* his Catechism, and thus practiced deception upon those who were to be the future pastors of the Palatinate churches, is simply monstrous, and is to fix an indeli-

ble stain upon his memory. In these *Lectures* he officially expounded a public standard of the faith, and did not merely discuss problems of theology. He was under the highest moral obligation to give the sense of the Catechism. And as to the *Lectures* themselves, now standing before us in an octavo volume of 659 pages, it can truthfully be said that there is not one line in the entire book, in which the author teaches that the purpose, intent and destination of Christ's atonement is the salvation of all men, or that all men are treated alike in the application of redemption, or that the promise of grace extends alike to all men, or that God wills alike the salvation of all men, or that in trying to ascertain the Predestination of God we must *begin* with the word of God. And as further evidence that the authors of the Catechism wished their work to be understood as harmonizing with Calvinism, we find that they had a German translation of Calvin's Catechism, printed by public authority at Heidelberg, bound together with the Heidelberg Catechism, one copy of which is known to exist to-day.* Not even in the answer to the thirty-seventh question, nor in Ursinus's exposition of the same, is there a single sentence to which Calvin himself might not have subscribed, since both the answer and the exposition simply affirm the sufficiency of Christ's sacrifice for the sins of all mankind, which Calvin freely conceded,† and declared "that Christ has taken upon himself and suffered the punishment which by the righteous judgment of God impended over all sinners; that by his blood he has expiated those crimes that render them odious to God;"‡ while the historians of the Catechism have proved that from the beginning the answer was interpreted in favor of the limited application of the atonement, or as having reference "solely to the whole company of the elect and faithful."§ And Sudhoff has shown beyond the possibility

* Good's *Origin of the Ref. Church in Germany*, p. 181, 189.

† *Consensus Genevensis*, p. 285.

‡ C. R., XXX, 369.

§ See Von Alpen's *Hist. and Lit. of the Heidelberg Cat.*, Berg's Translation, pp. 29-30. Sudhoff's *Theologisches Handbuch*, pp. 257-266, and his *Fester Grund*, *passim*, and Koecher, pp. 259 *et seqq.*

of refutation that through and through the Catechism is Calvinistic, and that Heppé's "discovery" that it is "Melancthonian," and "non-Calvinistic" is "out and out untenable" and "unhistorical." In his *C. Olevianus und Z. Ursinus*, pp. 88-124, Sudhoff has made a most thorough analysis of the Heidelberg Catechism, and has traced very many of the questions and answers to their Swiss sources, and has quoted (p. 482) Olevianus's letter to Bullinger, acknowledging indebtedness to the Swiss, and says that it is scarcely possible to find anything more decidedly predestinarian than Ursinus gives in his explanation of questions 17, 21, 27, 53, 54—"Election and Reprobation, both are the eternal counsels of God. The foundation is the free *beneficium* of God, so also in regard to Reprobation. * * * On Predestination I betake myself to the writings of Beza and Martyr" (p. 121). Henry Altling, professor at Heidelberg and Gröningen, who delivered public lectures on the Catechism, explains the answer to question 37 as meaning "that Christ suffered and died for the elect only and for believers," and declares that the explanation that favors the doctrine of the universality of redemption is "the dogma of the erroneous innovators," meaning thereby the Arminians, who, after the Catechism had been officially endorsed in Holland for more than a generation as a Calvinistic Catechism, had sought to give it a new meaning.* And Petrus de Witte, in his *Exposition of the Heidelberg Catechism*,† which was approved by the Classis of Hoorn, and passed through more than sixty editions, explains "all mankind" in Question 37, as meaning not *omnes universaliter*, but "all sorts of people, tongues," etc., and condemns the explanation of the Remonstrants as Socinian and Pelagian. Question 54 he explains in accordance with the

* Pp. 206-7. Altling delivered his *Lectures* on the Catechism after his return from the Synod of Dort. His object was to refute the interpretations of the Remonstrants, which had been hitherto almost unknown in the Palatinate. See Lewald's *Catechetischer Unterricht*, Preface, p. x.

† An English translation of this work was published at Amsterdam in 1654 for the English Reformed Congregation in that city. In Bastfngius's *Explanation and Commentary*, English translation, fifth edition, London, 1595, Question 54 is explained in the usual Calvinistic way.

Double Predestination. Many other questions are also explained by him in the Calvinistic sense. Indeed we are assured by the most competent scholars that every one of the old orthodox expositors has explained the answer to Question 37 in a Calvinistic sense.* But half a century ago Dr. Heppe "discovered" that the Heidelberg Catechism is "Melanchthonian." For a while he had followers, but at this time he is not known to have a single endorser of his view among the *scholars* of Germany. But his "discovery" has found an echo in the sympathetic bosom of Dr. Rupp, of the Reformed Seminary in Lancaster, Pa., who, as touching the Heidelberg Catechism, has undertaken to write history by ignoring the facts of history, and has sought to interpret said Catechism just as "the erroneous innovators" did three centuries ago. His logic seems to be as follows:

I am not Calvinistic.

I have subscribed the H. C.

Therefore the H. C. is not Calvinistic.

If there be any fallacy in the above syllogism, the acute Doctor will be quick to detect it. But in order to get Calvinism out of his H. C. he will have to divorce it from its authors, from its history, from its old orthodox expositors, from the endorsement of many Calvinistic synods, yea, from itself.

*Naturam expelles furca, tamen usque recurret,
Et mala perrumpet furtim fastidia victrix.*

Dr. Rupp's argument—he has not attempted to make a historical demonstration—can convince only those in whom, as in himself, the wish is father to the conclusion. The facts remain: The ecclesiastical conditions under which the Catechism was written were Calvinistic; its authors were Calvinistic; its *usus loquendi* is Calvinistic; its most ardent defenders have been Calvinistic; its ablest expounders have pronounced

* See the most convincing proof of this in Koecher's *Katechetische Geschichte*, pp. 259 *et seqq.* It is a well known fact that the Heidelberg Catechism was at once attacked by Lutherans and by Catholics, and later by Arminians, as *Calvinistic*. Frederick III requested Bullinger to defend the Heidelberg Catechism, and he complied with the request. Koecher, pp. 320 *et seqq.* and p. 343.

it Calvinistic; the most Calvinistic synods have endorsed it as Calvinistic. These facts cannot be overthrown by a few sporadic opinions, and by the fervid declamations of men who have determined beforehand to reject the conclusions to which the facts inevitably lead.

But Dr. Rupp is strong in imputation (p. 540 of the *Reformed Church Review* for October 1902)—the last resort of those who fail of facts and fail in arguments. *Palnam ferat qui meruit*. But instead of a *quid pro quo*, we submit the following page of facts and arguments from the learned Sudhoff: "The anti-Melachthonian doctrine of the perseverance of the saints that is peculiar to the Heidelberg Catechism, brings us irresistibly to the doctrine of Predestination. This is not indeed expressly developed in the Catechism, but it is a mistake to use this circumstance as a proof that the Palatinate doctrine differed by its anti-predestinarian character from the foreign Reformed. The Palatinate Catechism with its doctrine of sin and grace, of the certainty of salvation, the inamissibleness of Regeneration and of the perseverance of the saints, has Predestination as its necessary and incontestable premise. The Geneva Catechism did not develop the doctrine of Predestination any more than did the Heidelberg, and yet surely no one will be inclined to rank it with the anti-predestinarian witnesses, or with Melanchthonianism. Also, in a hand-book intended for popular purposes abstract theological explanations are not to be expected. On the contrary, without exception, when the Heidelberg Catechism was explained fully and theologically, the expounders, from Ursinus on, joined a thoroughgoing statement of the doctrine of Predestination to question 54. It is in accordance with a fundamental principle among the Heidelberg theologians that in the letter of Ursinus to Jacob Monau on Predestination, the following stands on the margin: Referatur ad locum de predestinatione Qu. 54. All foreign and genuinely predestinarian Reformed find their spirit and their doctrine in the Heidelberg Catechism, as is proved by the indisputable facts, that they introduced it as an orthodox hand-book, that the Calvinistic Hollanders unfurled it as a banner for the Calvinistic doctrine,

and that the Dordrecht synod proclaimed it an out-and-out Reformed and orthodox hand-book. Yet it has been asserted that Predestination is not in the Catechism, for the reason that it could not have arisen under the circumstances from which the Catechism arose, and that its authors had never *thought of falling away (!) to Calvinism*. This very confident affirmation is absolutely false. The circumstances from which the Palatinate Catechism sprang were most distinctly characterized by that which was usual with the Reformed, and were in full doctrinal harmony with the Reformed of other countries. Peter Martyr and Zanchius were undoubtedly Predestinarians. The former was to have Reformed the Palatinate, but sent his like-minded pupil to do it. The latter was driven out of Strassburg largely on account of Predestinarianism. And how his later colleagues Boquin Tremellius, Olevianus and Diller agreed with him and with his doctrinal position we will hereafter discover in the *Opinion* which they presented, August 25th, 1561, in support of the persecuted Calvinist. That teaches Predestinarianism unqualifiedly. Finally as regards the authors of the Catechism, it has occurred to no one in earnest to regard Olevianus, the pupil of Calvin, as anti-predestinarian, as not Calvinistic. But Ursinus, who through the Zurichers, especially through Martyr, received his complete Reformed training, and through his influence found his position in Heidelberg, showed himself in all his writings as a distinct supporter of the predestinarian doctrine.* We place Sudhoff's array of indisputable facts over against the *naïveté* of Dr. Rupp, whose "partisan chicanery and special pleading"—if it be not a sin against the *suaviter in modo* to use his own language—have betrayed him into many fallacies of logic, and have almost completely closed his eyes to the meaning of history. That in his judgment of the Heidelberg Catechism Dr. Rupp should conceive himself to be right, and all the old orthodox expounders of the Catechism from Ursinus on, to be wrong, is truly pathetic, and calls for commiseration. The question between him and us, or rather between him and the learned men

* *Olevianus und Ursinus*, pp. 119-121.

of his own Church, is not one of "pretensions to superior learning"—though such pretensions (if made) could be easily established in favor of the latter—but one of facts, and of the fair interpretation of the facts. The learned men of the Reformed Church have given the facts. Dr. Rupp has in part ignored the facts, in part explained them away, and in part evaded their significance. His declaration "that the authors of the Catechism were themselves not deeply impressed with the doctrine of Calvinistic predestination," is disproved absolutely by their writings, which, we are prepared to show, state the Double Predestination as sharply and as antithetically as it is stated in Calvin's *Institutes*. We cannot forbear to ask: Has Dr. Rupp read those writings where they discuss the subject of Predestination? And after what has been said in the first two installments of this essay it is perfectly ridiculous for Dr. Rupp to contend still that Justification occupies the same place in the Reformed system that it occupies in the Lutheran system, or that Predestination has ever occupied the same place in the Lutheran system that it has occupied and still occupies in the Reformed system, and that the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper is alone, or even *chiefly*, responsible for the schism between the two Reformation Theologies. The cause of the schism must be found in the difference of conception as touching the cause, the extent, the purpose of redemption, and the method of applying the same; or, more concretely, in the difference in position and significance which the two Reformation Theologies assign to Justification and Predestination. That Dr. Rupp may be convinced of this we beg him to study the *origines* of the two theologies in question, and to consult the scholars of his own Church on this subject, and especially on the history and interpretation of the Heidelberg Catechism.

3. Other Calvinistic Confessions.*

The number of Calvinistic confessions is so great that we

* Shedd, *Hist. Doctrine*, II, pp. 458-491. Müller's *Bekenntnisschriften der. Ref. Kirche*.

cannot particularize about them. They all bear the impress of that powerful hand that systematized the theology of the Reformed churches, though the impress is not equally heavy on each of these confessions. The Gallic Confession of 1559, the Scotch of 1560, the Belgic of 1561, the Anglican of 1562, the Dordrecht Canons of 1619, the Westminster Confession of 1647, are the most important of these confessions, and have exerted the widest influence. By unanimous consent they all contain the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination* (though they do not all express it with the same rigor), and the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and gave rise to the scholastic Reformed theology as over against the scholastic Lutheran theology. One has only to read these confessions to see that by their order, and by their whole *modus loquendi*, they are

* Some Anglican Theologians have tried to show that Article XVII of the Anglican Confession is not *Calvinistic*, just as some have tried to show that the XXXIX Articles are not *Protestant*, but *Catholic*. The effort in the one direction has proved as futile as in the other. Beyond question the Anglican Confession as a whole was intended to be and is *Protestant*. That its XVII Article is and was intended to be *Calvinistic* is placed beyond question by the following facts: The compilers and revisers of the Articles were Calvinists; they had the courage of their convictions; they expressed their beliefs without concealment or compromise; they were in close communication with the Swiss theologians; they submitted their drafts to the foreign Calvinistic divines residing at the Universities and to Knox; the oldest commentators on the Articles, expounded Article XVII in a strong Calvinistic sense (see Rogers's *The Catholic Doctrine of the Church of England*, 1586); the Article not only expresses the sentiments of Calvin, but the expressions in the original are identical with the expressions of Calvin's *Institutes*. Especially do we note the *per Christum* and the *in Christo*; so that all the Article teaches is taught in Calvin, though the Article does not teach Calvinism in its extreme form. Archbishop Laurence's Bampton Lectures, 1804, which show in their author more dislike for Calvinism than knowledge of the subject, must be pronounced a failure as regards their main contention. Dr. John Hunt, Vicar of Otford in Kent, is quite right when he says: "It may now be admitted by all that the compilers of the Articles of religion were Calvinists in doctrine and strongly Protestant, that they gave expression to their beliefs without any effort at concealment or compromise." He regards this as one of the questions settled by the controversies of the nineteenth century. *Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century*. London, 1896, p. 372.

Calvinistic, and that they are the products of the application of the Calvinistic fundamental principle. If any, or some, or many of the more recent subscribers of these confessions have understood them in a non-Calvinistic sense, they have done this in the face of the history of these confessions, and in contradiction of the early expounders of the same, and in antagonism to the theology that sprang out of them.

But besides these Confessions that bear a fundamental relation to certain national churches, there are some confessions of a more local and restricted relation, that exhibit the same decidedly Calvinistic character and quality; as, among others, the Hungarian of 1562, which has a chapter on "the eternal preaching of the Gospel for begetting faith in the Elect, and for hardening the Reprobate;" the Debreczin Confession of 1562 which has an article under the title: "Of the Predestination of the elect unto life, and of the reprobate to eternal destruction;" the Bremen Confession of 1595, to which all Bremen ministers were pledged until 1784,* and which contains a large chapter entitled: "Of the eternal Predestination of the Elect and of the Reprobate;" the Stafford Book of 1599, which treats the Double Predestination after the most approved Calvinistic style; the Bohemian Confession of 1609 which represents "the redemption of all the Elect" as the most important work of the Trinity; the Benthaim Confession of 1613, which has an article that declares that "God has elected and adopted us as sons according to the *beneplacitum* of his will and for the praise of the glory of his grace;" the Confession of Sigismund of 1614, which declares that the article of the Eternal Predestination to eternal life is the most comforting of all.

These minor confessions† of the Reformed churches were for the most part called out by local needs and conditions; but they did not supplant nor exclude the more fundamental and comprehensive Heidelberg Catechism and Second Helvetic Confession, one or both of which were almost invariably acknowl-

* Müller, *Ib d*, LIV.

† Found in Müller, *ut supra*.

edged along with the local creed, and both of which were the most widely accepted and approved of all the Reformed Creeds, and were the common bonds that held the Reformed churches in fraternal unity, until that unity culminated in and was consummated by the Canons of Dort in 1619, though some trifling differences, as those between the Supralapsarians and the Infralapsarians, and some diverse views of the relation of Christ to Election, still existed. "But these differences," says Dr. Karl Müller—"this must be emphasized over against much recent shuffling in regard to the state of the case—nevertheless sink into nothing as compared with the great unity in the anti-synergistic predestinarian faith, to which the Reformed theologians of all Europe (with only insignificant exceptions) then bound themselves. To the Canons was joined a rejection of errors. The desire of the Hessians (Cruciger) and the Bremene (Crocus) for an explanation against the harsh expressions of the other theologians was not granted, as it was feared that with the words the substance might be affected. At the 140th session, April 25th, 1619, the Canons with all the accessories were ratified. Then the Synod approved the Netherland confessions, the Belgic, and the Heidelberg Catechism. Thus the Church of Holland was saved, and by the aid of the foreign brethren it was fortified by a new bulwark."*

Equally clear is Heppé as to the complete Calvinizing of the entire Reformed Church. He says: "The Leipzig Colloquy was the last occasion that exhibited the peculiarity of the German Reformed doctrine of Predestination. Over against the mighty influence exerted by the distinguished and imposing church authorities represented by the Calvinistic theology, the German Reformed Church could not preserve its peculiarity. Moreover, the action of the Synod of Dort, in which nearly all the German State churches saw themselves united with the Reformed abroad into one denomination, worked upon Reformed territory just as the Form of Concord did upon Lutheran territory. Interest in cultivating what was peculiar to separate sec-

* Müller, *ut supra*, LXIV.

tions of the Church by means of former relations vanished before the interest of cultivating what was common to all the opponents of the Reformed Confession. German Reformed Dogmatics, therefore, at once embraced the infralapsarian mode of reasoning found in non-German theology. Yet there were always individual utterances that indicated that the former had its origin in the development of German Protestantism."*

These conclusions of two most competent Reformed theologians, based on the widest possible induction of facts, stand as absolutely conclusive against the bald assertion, made not only without supporting facts, but in the face of the most patent facts, by Dr. Rupp, in the *Reformed Church Review* for January, 1902, and defended in the October number of the same periodical, that "the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination was never accepted by the German Reformed Church, either in Europe or in America. Individual theologians held it, but not the Church itself." But the fact is that the German Reformed theologians as a class held that doctrine, and the German Reformed Universities taught it, and the confessions adopted by the German Reformed Church, notably the Second Helvetic Confession, the French Confession and the *Corpus et Syntagma*, express it; and at Dort the official subscription to the Canons by the German Reformed theologians, without a single word of protest, formally committed the German Reformed Church to the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination.

To be convinced of all this let any one read Schweizer's *Centraldogmen*, and his *Glaubenslehre d. Ev. Reformirten Kirche*; Heppes *Dogmatik d. Ref. Kirche*, and his *Dogmatik d. Deutschen Protestantismus*, and Dr. Karl Müller's *Bekenntnisschriften d. Ref. Kirche*, and let him recall the fact that members of the Reformed Church in any country were received without question in any Reformed Church of any country by letters of transfer; that in every colloquy of the German Reformed with Lutherans, the former committed the German Reformed Church to the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, and that writers on

* *Dogmatik d. Deutschen Protestantismus*, II, p. 75.

Symbolics class the German Reformed confessions and the confessions that proceeded from Calvin and his immediate disciples, together as belonging to one and the same family, and describe them as bearing one and the same generic quality—proceeding as we have suggested, the student of dogmatics and of symbolics will have the demonstration that the German Reformed Church in Europe did accept the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, though it must be conceded that upon the whole its type of Calvinism was milder than was that of France, Holland and some other countries, just as the type of Lutheranism in some countries, and even in some Lutheran bodies of the same country, has been and is milder than that in other countries and in other bodies in the same country. It is not assumed that to be a Calvinist one must necessarily endorse the *Consensus Genevensis*, or subscribe the Westminster Confession, any more than it is assumed that to be a Lutheran one must endorse Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio*, or subscribe the Form of Concord. And as for the German Reformed in America, suffice it to say that sometimes they were called "German Presbyterians," sometimes "Dutch Calvinists," that they organized themselves according to Holland models, were supported by "the Holland Stipend," and for nearly half a century conducted themselves subject to orders from Holland, and at the request of the Holland deputies adopted the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of Dort, as the following shows: "Article III. The President stated that a writing must be drawn up in regard to the following instruction given to the Rev. Michael Schlatter by the Venerable Christian Synods of South and North Holland to this effect: 'That the members of the Reverend Cœtus should sign the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of the National Synod of Dort of 1618 and 1619, declaring that they with heart and soul were devoted to the same, and will hold to them unchanged.' The Reverend Cœtus considered it right and necessary to do this, and thereupon the following was submitted: We the undersigned ministers in actual service in the Reformed congregations in Pennsylvania, having appeared at the appointed cœtus in Philadelphia, September

28, 1748, together with the accompanying elders from our congregations, do hereby affirm that we are devoted with heart and soul to the Heidelberg Catechism and the Canons of the National Synod of Dort of 1618 and 1619, and that we will hold them unchanged, as we do hereby."*

This formula was subscribed in 1748 by all the elders present, and by all the ministers present, except one, who subscribed with the Cœtus in 1752; and the Cœtus renewed its subscription 1755, 1765 and 1788.

These facts taken from official records must forever silence the deliverance of Dr. Rupp that the German Reformed Church in America never accepted the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination; for if the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination be not expressed in the Canons of Dort, then it is not expressed in any confession in the world, and if the acceptance of these Canons and of the Heidelberg Catechism "with heart and soul," by the ministers and elders of the German Reformed Coetus, did not make, mark, and define them, and consequently the churches represented by them, as Calvinistically Predestinarian, it is because said ministers and elders had neither heart nor soul. Hence, concluding from the facts given above it is quite too late in the day for Dr. Rupp to try to maintain that the German Reformed Church, neither in Europe nor in America, ever accepted the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination. But in support of his thesis he has again both ignored and misapplied the facts of history and the witness of the documents. The consequence is that his thesis contributes nothing to the history of doctrine and of symbolics—except private opinion; and private opinion neither destroys facts nor creates truth. Dr. Rupp cannot read the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination out of the history of the German Reformed Church, until he shall have first annihilated the history of that Church; and to contend that Justification by faith alone has the same place and the same significance in the German Reformed Church that it has in the Lutheran Church, is to ignore or to misconceive the

* Good's *Hist. Ref. Ch. in the U. S.*, pp. 353-4. See also *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, 1897, p. 636.

facts contained in the foregoing pages, and to contradict the conclusions of the most learned and impartial theologians of both churches.

It is because of the significance of the doctrine of Justification by faith in the Lutheran Church, and its relation to all other doctrines of the Lutheran system, that we have called it, as she teaches it, the distinguishing doctrine of the Lutheran Church. And in this we know ourself to be in harmony with all sound Lutheran teaching.

THE CONCLUSION.

The reader who has followed us through this long essay is doubtless convinced that there are two Reformation Theologies, that is, two theologies that in their fundamental and distinguishing aspects date from the time of the Reformation. There is the Lutheran theology, which is determined by its own central principle of Justification by faith alone. There is the Reformed (Zwinglio-Calvinistic) theology which is determined by its central principle of Predestination.

In our exhibition of the fundamental principles of these theologies we have used only original materials. When it was thought desirable to confirm conclusions by learned opinion, we have invariably quoted Lutheran scholars on the side of the Lutheran theology, and Reformed scholars on the side of the Reformed theology. In this way we have sought to preserve impartiality of treatment. If we have sometimes criticized, it will be found that the criticisms are about as many and as distinct on the one side as on the other. Indeed it may be fairly concluded that were the fathers of the two Reformation theologies alive to-day, they would be the first to criticize many of the opinions which they have left on record. But their criticisms would not be likely to destroy the differences of the two theologies. The essential characteristics of each would remain.

Let us now particularize:

It has been sometimes said that the Lutheran theology is *Christocentric*. But such a characterization is not strictly correct, though it is but just to say that no theology makes so much of

Christ as does the Lutheran theology. For it is a fundamental and inalienable conception of this theology that it regards redemption as taking place *on account of Christ*; and the supreme aim of the preaching of the Gospel and of the administration of the sacraments is the presentation of Christ to man, who is the subject of salvation. The idea is that Christ is in the word and in the sacraments, and that he who receives the word and the sacraments by faith has salvation. But the Lutheran theology goes out from the discovered and recognized misery and helplessness of man. Hence rather is the Lutheran theology *anthropocentric*. Human sin and misery are facts and conditions that excite the compassion of God and of Christ, and lead to the preparation and to the offer of redemption in such a way that the final cause of redemption is *redemption*, that is, the deliverance of man from sin and misery. Such deliverance is accomplished through justification by faith alone, with the conception that he who is justified is consequently saved. Hence justification is identified with salvation, and is therefore held to be the eternal principle of Christianity, inasmuch as the whole redemptory economy concentrates itself upon this one divine act, the pardon of sin and the adoption to sonship. God, foreseeing, before the foundation of the world, the sin and misery of man, provided *eternal* redemption for us, or so loved the world as to give his only begotten Son that whosoever believeth in Him might not perish, but have everlasting life. Justification by faith, therefore, is the one great, grand idea, and this idea becomes a reality by virtue of the suffering and death of Christ, but only when the person and work of Christ are inwardly appropriated by a living faith, which is sought alone by the Holy Ghost through the so-called means of grace, which are the sole media by which we learn of God's gracious will of salvation. Hence the divine word is held to be the undecceptive revelation of God's will of salvation. In that word, according to the Lutheran theology, beginning with Luther, God sincerely offers salvation to all men, so that it is the fault of the will of man if the hearer of the Gospel be not saved. According to the Lutheran theology—the idea can be traced back

through Melancthon's *Loci* even to Luther's Preface to Romans—God predestinates believers to salvation, but does not predestinate any to destruction. In other words, the Double Predestination, which never was germane to the Lutheran fundamental principle, was not embodied in the Lutheran confessional theology, and was not developed and defended in the Lutheran *Dogmatic*. But the doctrine of Justification by faith, which from the beginning had fundamental and principiant place and significance remains at the center of all true Lutheran theology, and gives shape, coloring and significance to each and every doctrine of the Lutheran system. Or, to state the case more concretely, Justification by faith alone makes the Lutheran system what it is, in distinction from every other conception of the economy of redemption. Hence in proportion as other theologies push this doctrine of justification by faith alone toward the place that it has in the Lutheran system, and give it the significance that it has in the Lutheran system, do they thus approximate the Lutheran theology. But there can be no identification or coalescence of the two Reformation Theologies so long as each holds fast to its own determinative principle.

It has been said, and justly, we think, that the Calvinistic theology is *theocentric*. In this theology God is the one grand, sublime thought. Not only does salvation have its cause in God, more exactly in the *beneplacitum* of God, but the end of all the divine operations with reference to man's eternal destiny, not only in the election of a small number to eternal life, but in the reprobation of the vast majority to eternal death, is the glorification of God. The perception by God of sin and misery in man does not act as cause for the exercise of the divine compassion toward man, since God is not moved by anything outside of his own *beneplacitum*. Indeed, man fell into sin by the ordination of God, and sin furnished only the occasion for the most free exercise of the divine compassion, and for the exhibition of the most just judgment of God. Redemption is not *on account of Christ, but through Christ*, who is one in a series of appointed instrumentalities for the execution of the secret

decree of election. Men are not elected because they have faith, but that they may have faith. Christ did not embrace all men in the purpose and destination of his atonement, but only some of all classes. Hence the call of the Gospel does not come to all men on the same conditions and with the same end in view. To some it comes accompanied by the efficacious operation of the Holy Ghost, and hence is, and is designed to be, a savor of life unto life. To others it comes without any efficacious operation of the Holy Ghost, and is, and is designed to be, a savor of death unto death. In reality the call of the Gospel is exactly commensurate with election, of which it is the first symbol. Election, therefore, is the ruling idea. The call of the Gospel and the justification of the sinner are subordinate to election. They are instruments for carrying election into effect. And if we consider the so-called means of grace a little more accurately, they are indeed means for executing the decree of particularistic election, but they are not a veritable dealing of God in Christ with man, and in such a way that by the word and the sacraments God offers salvation to all alike, with the intention involved of saving all, or of placing all in the way of salvation. Especially are the sacraments regarded more as pledges and seals of grace than as instruments for the bestowment of grace. Logically, indeed they could have no other significance, when once it is understood that the particular subject of grace has been selected already by the eternal decree of the gracious predestination; and even the word is only a testimony that one has been elected.

Such then, we may say, is the Lutheran, and such the Calvinistic theology. Each has its own regulating principle, and each is what its principle, logically applied, has made it. But by this it is not meant that it is possible to determine *a priori* the place and significance of every more or less peripheral doctrine in the system. But having the center we are bound to place and to construe every other doctrine in such a way as to harmonize with the central doctrine, and so as to contribute to the realization of that for which the principle stands, viz., the redemption of man. As the Lutheran theology finds the reali-

zation of its principle in the gratuitous pardon of sin *on account of Christ*, so in the Lutheran theology every subordinate doctrine must be made to assist in bringing the grace of God *for Christ's sake* into the purview and in applying that grace. As the Zwinglio-Calvinistic theology finds realization of its principle in the execution of the eternal decree, so every subordinate doctrine must be made to assist in executing that decree, for it is a fundamental principle of the Zwinglio-Calvinistic theology, that as God has elected some to salvation, so has he appointed all the means necessary for the attainment of their salvation.

Therefore, it is in the way indicated, that we can say that each theology is the product of its own central principle. The principles being different it must result that the theologies would be different. Hence it must follow naturally and necessarily that the two theologies, as already intimated can never coalesce into one. They will remain two so long as each adheres to its own central principle. But during the last hundred years the Zwinglio-Calvinistic theology has gradually lost much of its predestinarian rigor. Dr. Charles Hodge was a decided infalapsarian, and spoke only of the preterition of the wicked. His son, Dr. A. A. Hodge, gave remarkable prominence to *Christ* in his *Popular Lectures on Theological Themes*. Dr. Henry B. Smith declared that "the Reformed theology has got to *christologize* predestination and the decrees." Dr. Fairbairn, in his *Christ in Modern Theology*, has spoken of Christ almost as a Lutheran. The German Reformed generally profess to have christologized their theology; and the Revision of the Westminster Confession has placed a large body of active Christians in this country on the plane of a greatly modified Calvinism. But in this instance the Calvinistic system has not been abandoned. The Lutheran theology holds its principle intact, but there is a decided tendency also to christologize. The result is a mutual approximation, but by no means a coalescence. The Lutheran theology is still in principle the Lutheran theology, and the Zwinglio-Calvinistic theology is still in principle the Zwinglio-Calvinistic theology. But the adherents of each theology respect and assist each other as they did not do in former

centuries. Lutheran theologians no longer call the martyrs of the Reformed, "Martyrs of the devil," and the Reformed Theologians no longer class Lutherans with Jesuits, Socinians, Semi-Pelagians and Remonstrants. Nor would the theological world now tolerate the violence that characterized the controversies of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The era of charity and good will has succeeded the era of hate and mutual exclusion. Each theology stands for a great principle, and each conserves a great body of truth, and each is stronger and more symmetrical by reason of the presence of the other. Each will best fulfill its mission by respecting itself, by learning from the other, by opening its heart to every new truth that shines out of God's word, and by adapting itself to the needs of the times as time goes and comes.

ARTICLE IV.

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

BY JOHN J. YOUNG, D.D.

Biblical scholars have of late years devoted their labors almost exclusively to the Old Testament. Whilst this has placed portions of the same in an unsettled condition it has, nevertheless, brought out the vast importance of this old and venerable part of our Sacred Scriptures. A short time ago it appeared to some at least, that Professor F. Delitzsch, of the University of Berlin, Germany, had beyond dispute succeeded in placing Babel ahead of the Bible. But Professor H. V. Hilprecht, of the University of Pa., has again reversed the order. Both are eminent Assyriologists, and are basing their arguments on the discoveries made in their archeological researches. Whilst Professor Hilprecht is boldly holding and fearlessly defending the position he has taken, Professor Delitzsch has, since the appearance of the Emperor's letter, somewhat calmed down. In fact, of late he prefers to lecture upon the great difficulties and dangers connected with the excavations at Babylon, instead of the relation between Babel and the Bible.

Since some claim that only Assyriologists are capable of taking an active part in this lively and important discussion, and since we do not belong to that learned and greatly privileged class of scholars, we will, therefore, allow the Assyriologists to settle the now burning question between Babel and the Bible, and will turn our attention to something nearer at hand than the ruins of ancient Babylonia, namely, the four Gospels. We do this not because we have no faith in the archeological researches, but to find out what He, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. 2:3), has to say about the Old Testament. Surely Christ's testimony upon this important subject should not be overlooked. Hence our subject:

CHRIST AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A reader of the Gospels will soon find out that Christ in His *conflicts* with men and spirits used the Old Testament. It was to Him both an offensive and defensive weapon, by means of which He invariably carried off the victory. When Satan approached Him in the wilderness to tempt Him, He not only defended Himself with the same, but He also defeated there-with the tempter. Every assault was met with and repulsed by a quotation from the well-known book Deuteronomy. Matthew tells us (22:36-39), that one day a certain lawyer approached the Lord with a view of tempting Him. "Master," said he, "which is the great commandment in the law?" He silenced him by saying: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. The second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." The first is taken from the book of Deuteronomy and the second from Leviticus.

When we study the instruction the Lord imparted, either unto the people or His Apostles, we will find that the Old Testament was the foundation of his religious teaching. A careful study of that matchless discourse, known as the Sermon on the Mount, will be sufficient to convince any one of that fact. The instruction imparted to His disciples during the

forty days after His resurrection consisted almost entirely in explaining to them the law of Moses, the Prophets and the Psalms. These books were looked upon and used by Him as the only and absolute authority in matters of religion. In fact, from the beginning of His ministry to the very end was He using and explaining the Old Testament, especially those portions referring to Himself, and He invariably used those books as absolute authority—as the infallible Word of God.

His *manner of referring to*, or of describing the Old Testament, is also very instructive and of great importance. He speaks of it as "the word of God," and "the Scriptures." These, He declares, "cannot be broken" (Jno. 10 : 35). Again, He speaks of the "Commandments of God" in opposition to the traditions of men (Matt. 15 : 3). In another place we find Him dividing the Old Testament into "Moses," "the prophets" and "the psalms" (Luke 24 : 44). These He expounds to His disciples as containing an infallible account of Himself; as setting forth His sufferings, death, resurrection and entrance into glory (Luke 24 : 25-27). "Moses," said He to the fault-finding Jews, "wrote of me." Again, "but if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (Jno. 5 : 47). In turning to the 17th chapter of John we find the following statements referring to the Sacred Scriptures: "They have kept thy word" (v. 6), "I have given them thy word" (v. 14), "Sanctify them through the truth; thy word is truth" (v. 17). That Christ is in this remarkable chapter addressing His heavenly Father is a fact beyond dispute. Hence the expression, "Thy word" must also refer to the Father. We have, therefore, reason to believe that the words "Thy word," point to the Old Testament. Here we have the Scriptures of the Old Testament described by Christ Himself as the word of God, the truth and the instrument of sanctification. The Saviour's words: "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me," are also of great importance upon this subject. By "Scriptures" He refers, beyond a doubt, to the Old Testament as possessed by the Jews. Hence through his description of the

Old Testament Christ not only endorses the Jewish Canon, but he also declares it to be God's Word.

When we turn to the EVENTS recorded in the Old Testament we will find that Christ looked upon them as real historical facts, and not as myths borrowed from the Babylonians, or other ancient nations. Even the creation of man, as recorded in Genesis, is spoken of by Him as a fact. "Have ye not read," said He, "that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female" (Matt. 19:4). According to these words God created originally a single pair, namely, one man and one woman, or a single individual of each sex. And just as He looked upon this as a fact and taught it as such, thus did He also look upon the marriage between two persons, one male and one female, or monogamy, as a divine institution. Upon this important subject of marriage between two persons only, Christ quoted Gen. 2:24, saying: "For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh" (Matt. 19:5). Hence the marriage between two persons, and two only, is, according to Christ's interpretation of Genesis, a divine institution, which the Lord ordained in the very beginning. The murder of the righteous Abel by his brother Cain, as found recorded in the fourth chapter of Genesis, is also looked upon by Him as a historical fact, and not as a heathen fable. This is evident from His words found in Matt. 23:35. There he says: "That upon you," that is, Jerusalem, "may come all the righteous blood shed upon earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar." Thus it is also with the deluge, the destruction of Sodom and the fate of Lot's wife. These are looked upon by Him and taught as historical facts and not as myths (Luke 17:26-32). According to the instruction imparted by Christ, Abel, Noah, Abraham, Lot and his wife, Isaac and Jacob, were not mythical characters, but real historical persons. Thus it is also with the great law giver, Moses. He recognizes him not only as a person who actually lived upon this earth, but also as a writer of a portion of the Sacred Scriptures. This is evident from his division of the Old Testament

into three parts, namely: Moses, Prophets and Psalms, (Luke 24:44). He, however, not only ascribes to Moses a portion of the Old Testament, but he also describes him as an actual writer. This is evident from His words: "For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me." Again he says: "But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (Jno. 5:46-47).

A study of the *references* to the Old Testament is also very instructive and exceedingly important upon this subject. That students may differ as to the number of books and verses referred to by Christ in the four Gospels, will be readily admitted by those who have carefully investigated the subject. Yet, notwithstanding the slight difference that may arise, all must, nevertheless, marvel at the Saviour's wonderful familiarity with the Old Testament. We believe we have found the following books referred to by Christ in the four Gospels: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, I Samuel, I and II Kings, II Chronicles, Nehemiah, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Joel, Jonah, Michael, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Zechariah and Malachi. In Matthew we find about 106 references; in Mark, about 50; in Luke, about 54; and in John about 17. We find thus about 227 references; some of these are, of course, repetitions. Beginning with the largest number of references the books run as follows: Isaiah is referred to 43 times; Psalms, 36; Deuteronomy, 29; Daniel, 19; Exodus, 18; Zechariah, 13; Leviticus, 12; Genesis, 11; Jeremiah, 8; Malachi, 7; Ezekiel, 15; Hosea, 4; I Samuel, Proverbs and Michael, 3 each; II Chronicles, Job and Zephaniah, 2 each; Numbers, Joshua, I Kings, II Kings, Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, Joel, Jona and Habakkuk, 1 each. From this it appears that the following books are not quoted or referred to by Christ in the four Gospels: Judges, Ruth, II Samuel, I Chronicle, Ezra, Esther, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Amos, Obadiah, Nahum and Haggai.

As far as these twelve books are concerned we do not know why Christ did not refer to them in the four Gospels. Hence we must be careful as to our conclusions upon this subject. The books are largely historical, containing very little concern-

ing our Saviour and his work of redemption. They are valuable so far as history and genealogy are concerned. Some of them are referred to in the Gospels, but not by Christ Himself. One thing we must bear in mind, namely: in the four Gospels we do not possess all the teachings of our Saviour, but only a limited part of the same. For all we know every book of the Old Testament may have been alluded to by Him. This is highly probable when we remember that in the very few words handed down to us, no less than 27 out of the 39 books composing the Old Testament are referred to by Him.

Under this head we must call attention to another important fact. A careful study of the books cited by Christ will reveal, that among the books most frequently quoted by Him are the very books that have been most severely tested by the higher critics; whilst the few unmentioned books have received but little attention. This is something remarkable; a fact that should cause us to reflect. Why this difference? Is it because they contain more about Christ's person, natures, offices and work of redemption than the others? Whatever may be the reason one thing remains sure, namely; our Saviour's view and use of those books differ entirely from those of the higher critics. Look, for instance, at the first nine chapters of Genesis. No trace can be found in the Gospels where Christ treated these as containing myths and legends borrowed from earlier nations. He treats the contents of these chapters as historical facts and looks upon them as a divine revelation. These remarkable nine chapters, whose contents have puzzled so many, are referred to and quoted by Christ in the four Gospels no less than nine times. Among these references we find the creation of male and female, or of Adam and Eve; the institution of marriage between one male and one female; Paradise; the fall of man brought about by the liar and murderer from the beginning; the murder of righteous Abel; the great wickedness before the deluge; Noah; the Ark; the flood, etc. These are treated by Him as real and solemn facts and not as trivial and ridiculous myths. He makes no distinction, whatever, between these nine chapters and the others portion of the Old Testament.

Having thus briefly summed up Christ's testimony in regard to the Old Testament, the question now is, Is there any way to account for the great difference between Christ's use and treatment of the Old Testament, and the use and treatment it has received and is now receiving from those, who hold views apparently opposite to His? We reply: The efforts thus far put forth in this direction may be summed up under three different heads.

First. Looking upon Christ "as a child of His times," it is both natural and reasonable to suppose that He was mistaken concerning the supernatural authority of the Old Testament; especially of those portions looked upon by some as mythical.

Secondly. That Christ knew better, but adapted Himself to the views and knowledge of the people, who had been taught that those wonderful accounts were real historical facts and divine revelation. He, for some reason, did not wish to disturb their minds or shake their faith in the same. Hence He purposely left them in the dark concerning certain portions of their Scriptures. He may have thought that, if He tried to rectify their wrong views, He might turn the people entirely from Him and thus be unable to instruct them about the Kingdom of God.

Thirdly. That He was right and that all those, who declare those portions of the Old Testament, that do not agree with their investigations and conceptions, as mythical, are wrong.

Let us now turn our attention to these three different heads in order to find out, as far as we are able, which one gives the best and truest solution of the great difference existing between Christ and some of our modern interpreters of the Old Testament.

As to the *first*. That Christ was "a child of His times" and as such was liable to make mistakes, we would reply: It is evident that Christ was born a child and that He grew up in time; for He was born of the Virgin Mary and was reared at Nazareth. As a child He was capable of receiving impressions like other children, and doubtless did. Yet, according to the only reliable account we have of His childhood, namely, that in

the four Gospels, He nevertheless differed somewhat from the children of His times. We are told, for instance, that "the child grew, and waxed strong in Spirit : and that the grace of God was upon him" (Luke 2 : 40). So far as His wisdom from childhood up is concerned He was far from being "a child of His times." This is evident from the circumstances connected with His visit to Jerusalem at the age of twelve. The intelligence, manifested in His questions and answers, was of such a nature as to cause even the doctors in whose midst He was sitting to be astonished. For all we know there may have been present such celebrated scholars and teachers as Hillel, Simeon and Gamaliel. The astonishment He then and there produced upon those present shows plainly that the wisdom He possessed at the age of twelve far surpassed that of the exceptionally bright youths of His age; if not in some respects that of learned doctors. Since after that memorable event He kept on increasing in wisdom, it is evident that He had not yet attained perfection, but continued to increase in wisdom just as He did in stature and in favor with God and man. And the most remarkable thing about this is, that He increased in wisdom concerning divine things and the Sacred Scriptures without enjoying the instructions of the theological schools then in existence. This is evident from the words: "And the Jews marvelled, saying, How knoweth this man letters," meaning doubtless the Sacred Scriptures, "having never learned" (John 7 : 15). Hence He was also in this respect no more a child of the theological schools of His people, than "a child of His times." Now, since He kept on increasing in wisdom He must have been at the age of thirty, when He was about to enter His prophetic office, an exceptionally wise man, especially as far as divine things and the Sacred Scriptures are concerned.

Though thus in an extraordinary way well qualified with the power of discerning what is true and right, He, nevertheless, did not enter his public ministry till He had been anointed with the Holy Ghost. We are told that at His baptism the Spirit of God descended like a dove, and lighted upon Him; whilst a voice from heaven said: "This is my beloved Son, in whom

I am well pleased" (Matt. 3 : 16 and 17). Since Christ is God's "beloved Son" it is reasonable to suppose that He did not receive the Holy Spirit in the same limited way as great and wise men before Him, but without measure and limitation ; so that there rested upon him, according to the prophecy of Isaiah 11 : 2, the spirit of wisdom, understanding, counsel, might and knowledge. Hence there must have been hid in Him now "all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge" (Col. 2 : 3). Entering his prophetic office thus endowed it is somewhat difficult to understand how some men can even suppose that he was mistaken concerning the supernatural authority of the Old Testament, including those portions looked upon by some as mythical! Such a supposition not only greatly invalidates His prophetic office and throws suspicion upon the infallibility of His teachings, but it also seems unreasonable and unscriptural. Though some of these men may seek shelter under what is known as the "*Kenosis*"—a doctrine which seeks to determine the character of Christ's humiliation, based upon Phil. 2 : 7—yet any theory of the *Kenosis*, that will invalidate Christ's prophetic office and throw suspicion upon the infallibility of his entire teaching, seems to us unscriptural. Hence such a theory of the *Kenosis* should receive no more recognition than the theory that the end justifies the means.

It must be confessed, however, that Christ's own words : "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father" (Mark 13 : 32), seem to set a limit to His knowledge in his state of humiliation. So far as the apparent limitation of Christ's knowledge, found here, is concerned, we must not forget that this apparent limitation refers to a precise time of a future event, and not to past events recorded in the Old Testament, nor to the supernatural authority of the same. A careful study of God's Word, as to the precise time of future events, will show us, as Dr. C. F. Schaeffer has well said, that, "Whilst God has been pleased to reveal future events, He has always absolutely withheld all precise statements respecting the times of their occurrence" (*Luth. Com.*, vol. ii, p. 217). Without entering upon the criticisms of the learned scholars upon this

verse, we can safely infer, that Christ in His state of humiliation either refrained for the time from the use of His knowledge concerning "That day and hour;" or that he refused such a revelation to His disciples. Such a refusal we find, for instance, just before His ascension; at which time He had, according to our theologians, passed from the state of humiliation to that of exaltation. And the reason why, even in His state of exaltation, He refused to give unto them the precise time of a future event, was not for want of knowledge on His part, but because it was not for them to "know the times and seasons, which the Father hath put in his own power," (Acts 1 : 7). Whilst such an inference is perfectly warranted it is somewhat unwarranted to assume from these words of our Saviour that the knowledge He exercised in His state of humiliation was so imperfect that he was entirely mistaken concerning the supernatural authority of the Old Testament, especially those parts considered by some as mythical. How could He, who was full of grace and truth; who described Himself as "the truth," and who declared before Pontius Pilate that the end and purpose of His incarnation was "to bear witness unto the truth," be mistaken as to the witness he did bear concerning the Old Testament, which He declared to be God's Word and the truth? (John 17 : 1). This unwarranted assumption, instead of leading us out of difficulties and darkness, brings us to unsurmountable difficulties and impenetrable darkness. Hence there is nothing left except to give it up as unsafe and turn to Him, who is the true Way and Light of the world.

As to the *second*, that He knew better, but adapted Himself to the erroneous views of the people, leaving them purposely in darkness, in order that He might accomplish His end, we would answer: There is much worldly wisdom in this, but since Christ, as we have already seen, did not get His wisdom from the world, but from above, such an assumption is hardly fair. The wisdom from above is, according to the Bible (James 3 : 17), "first pure." That Christ did accommodate Himself to the intellectual condition of those whom He instructed is reasonable to suppose. In fact we believe that the following verse allows such a supposition: "I have yet many things to say unto you,

but ye cannot bear them now" (John 16 : 12). The accommodation spoken of here does, however, not refer to any erroneous views concerning things taught in the Old Testament, but to the weakness of their minds. They were not yet ready for the higher, deeper and fuller things He had in store for them. No where do we find that Christ left people in darkness and error, or made His teachings to harmonize with their darkness and error, in order that He might win them. This would class Him among those who hold that the end justifies the means. We cannot see how He, who, according to His own words, came into the world "to bear witness unto the Truth," and whose aim was to make people free from error and sin through the Truth, and thus prepare and bring them into the Kingdom of Truth, could be guilty of any thing like that. In fact His dealings with the woman of Samaria at Jacob's well plainly show that such an assumption is entirely groundless. A careful study of that event will clearly demonstrate that He did not allow those whom He sought to instruct to remain in darkness and error in regard to their religious views, but that He unhesitatingly condemned the same. In plain words did He say to that woman: "Ye worship, ye know not what." By which He undoubtedly meant: Your worship is purely an invention of man. This proves that He did disturb people's minds; that He did shake their faith in things pertaining to religion having no divine authority, but were mere inventions of men. Hence, since it is both unreasonable and unscriptural to assume that He, who did not sin and in whose mouth was found no guile (I Peter 2 : 22), could be guilty of such a deception, we must, therefore, reject the second supposition.

As to the *third*, we reply: Whilst we should always entertain the highest regard for indefatigable scholars, and encourage independent research in this as well as other spheres, we must not forget, that researches, upon which so much stress is being laid by men constantly on the alert for something new or striking, are not yet completed, but simply begun. It is, therefore, a great mistake to draw conclusions against the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament at this stage of the investigations that are

now being carried on. The great disagreement between Professors Delitzsch and Hilprecht proves this clearly. The impatience manifested by some and their hasty conclusions against a portion of the Old Testament, have not shaken the Church's faith in the same, but have simply revealed the attitude of those writers towards the Word of God.

That Christ used the Old Testament as a book containing solemn facts and truths instead of ridiculous fictions; as a book of supernatural and final authority, and as a book that contained the revealed will of God, is a fact that cannot be denied. We have every reason to believe that He was right; that the witness he did bear to the Old Testament was true and that there was no guile in His mouth. Hence, we believe that those who disagree with Him on this important subject are mistaken, regardless of their sincerity and scholarship.

ARTICLE V.

HARNACK'S 'ESSENCE OF CHRISTIANITY.'

BY ADAM STUMP, D.D.

The popular saying that to all questions there are two sides contains a dangerous falsehood. It should mean only that each question has its espousers and its opponents; that it divides public opinion into two parts. But what nowadays it is made to mean is, that there are two sides to truth, each of which is to be treated with equal leniency and charity. This is not so. The only sides of any question are not two true ones, but a true and a false. Between these there can be no neutral ground—no middle way—on which a rational being may stand. Finally he must be for or against. Nor where indifference were a crime, should he make any apologies for his conscientious convictions. Only let him remember his responsibility to God.

Some of us had thought that the person of Christ and the nature of Christianity, as well as the origin and early history of both, were settled subjects. Again have these things become

mooted questions in the learned world. It is the old test-problem, "What think ye of the Christ?" In a widely-read book we have another of many modern answers to it. As it seems to satisfy so many and is intended to offer grounds of conciliation to all, let us without boast of scholarship (for none is needed) give it such a patient hearing as we may. The English reader who will not peruse the at least temporarily famous "Wesen des Christentums," may find an introduction to the present article in Dr. Wenner's excellent resume of it in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY of October, 1901. He will also find the translation by T. B. Saunders under the title "What is Christianity" a fair substitute for the original. In the process of transference from the German there is some loss, but as a whole the English dress is not misleading. We could wish that all our good authors in the Fatherland might be equally well translated. Especially could we desire that the German answers to these insidious lectures might be so given to us in our American tongue. Their harmfulness would thus be arrested. For we cannot share the opinion that this work is in the interest of Christian truth. The six hundred enthusiasts who applauded the eloquent professor, while he was delivering these lectures, and the busy issues of the press have been scattering this new thistle-seed over the earth. Already in the United States we hear echoes from the lecture-room at Berlin. What the harvest will be remains to be seen. But it is the purpose of this paper to show that Harnack's Christianity is not that of the New Testament and that Harnack's Christ is not the Christ of the Gospels. Yet we have not here to do with a neology or with a new evangel, but only with *Arianus redivivus*. An old sea-monster has again lifted up his head out of the ooze of long-simmering heresies. The history of the Church proves that her most dangerous enemies have been, not those who have attacked her without, but those who have betrayed her from within. Sure of her firm foundations, she always could and still can *smile* in disdain upon the feeble onslaughts of her foes, but she does well to tremble when her own sons are ready to throw out the keys of the citadel. Both the factitious, unproved

theory of scientific evolution and the supercilious so-called higher criticism offer their services to the Christian Church, but, as the old proverb says, one must fear the Greeks even when they are bringing gifts (*Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*). The servants of Christ are upon no doubtful defense; they need no allies. The sacred ark may be trembling, when it is being conveyed by human hands; it is, however, not falling. There is no necessity that any modern Azzaites should support it with their hands. One hesitates a great while before being ready to criticise the work of a man who professes to be on the same side, and who claims to have a good motive. We will not question the plea of Dr. Harnack that he meant to throw oil upon the troubled waters of religious controversy. He proclaims himself the advocate of knowledge and peace. "*Der Erkenntniss und dem Frieden will ich dienen und nicht dem Streit*" (Intr. 1st ed.). But the fact that he mentions knowledge first is not accidental, for throughout the entire work he consistently gives it the first place. The book is "scientific" before it is irenic. Yet he acknowledges the claims of peace and thus far deserves credit for a noble motive. However, we can pay too high a price even for such a beautiful blessing. Christ refused to quiet the warring elements of his times, when the cost was too enormous, and instead deliberately offered the world fire and a sword. But if this scholar and orator, this gifted and magnetic professor, holding an exalted position in the Church, was sincere in his purpose, he perpetrated a monstrous failure. He succeeded only in pleasing the vanity of the enemies and in hurting the feelings of the friends of Christianity. He drew the battle into his own camp. The antagonists might securely rest on their arms while the protagonists are destroying one another. But peace with infidelity becomes infidelity to the faith.

We shall not discuss Harnack's entire book, but only his presentation of Christ and the Gospel. What he has to say (after lecture 10th) of Greek and Roman Catholicism, as well as of Protestantism, does not much concern us. He there is in his own peculiar realm, that of pure history, and in that he

may enjoy his unquestioned supremacy. Perhaps as a patristic historian but few in the world can cope with him. But just at this point arises our first objection. He is a specialist who did not remain in his native element. He did not realize as he passed over the boundary, in the language of the ancient poet, Ion: "We are but like a fish upon dry land" (Plutarch's *L. III*, 143). Nowadays it seems enough to be able to say of a man, "Ah, but he is a *savant* in his branch!" As though that fact gave him the right to stride into another scholar's specialty and arrogantly claim authority there! Yet this is exactly what Harnack, though not he alone, does. Such an attempt is preposterous. Without being an exegete, logician, or theologian, he imperiously sets out to say how little we have understood it and what Christianity really is. This only those who have experienced its power can tell us. Solomon was the wisest man of his day and John Baptist was the greatest prophet of all times, but he that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than either. The Father has not revealed his mysteries to the wise and prudent men of science, but, to the babes of faith and grace.

Harnack's disposition does not win favor with the unbiased reader. He is supercilious toward his critics, which always is the case with monocular specialism. Like a jeweler hunting for a flaw in a watch, it never fails to shut its eye to that which it does not want to see. In his preface to the fifth edition, he speaks thus of the writings of his opponents: "I read them and laid them aside. Alas I could not learn anything from them." The Roman See could not speak with a sublimer conceit. But to those who care not whether the pope's name be Pius or Harnack, such language prepares the mind to contest every inch of the argument.

If it were our aim to enter upon a critique of the entire book, there are many things of excellence at which we would linger. The author's style is admirable. He usually excels in a perspicacity in which so many German writers are deficient. There are nerves in his sentences. His language has a force, movement, and aptness which are delightful. In thought he is like a giant

who uses the mountains as stepping-stones in his progress over the earth. However, he loses sight of the fruitful valleys between his feet, and here is a weakness. It is not barren peaks, however sublime, that feeds men. When Harnack says, "Other religions no longer stir the depths of our hearts," thus giving Christianity the supreme place, we feel sorry that we cannot always walk with him. "Die anderen bewegen uns in Tiefsten nicht mehr" (p. 4). When he tells us (p. 5) that Christianity is aiming at only this high simple point: "Eternal Life in the midst of time," we cannot demur. We can only wait to hear what definition and account of the method he will give. We are excusable for being a little suspicious, for does not history itself prove that heresy has often employed the language of orthodoxy? Toward the end of the first lecture he confesses that "In history we are not able to pass absolute judgments." We are glad for this mark of humility. It does not appear on every page. But originality does, and we rejoice in its lustre. Here is a man who might say with Edersheim: "But I wished to avoid cumbering my pages with an array of authorities, which too often give a mere appearance of learning" (Preface to Temple). But while we do not miss Harnack's extra-canonical documents, we do miss the proofs of the most important of his assertions. For a professedly humble man he often speaks too oracularly.

The account of the idea of the Messiah which prevailed among the Jews just before and at the coming of Christ, the relation of the process of how the Greek philosophy in regard to the Logos and the person of Christ became equivalent, as also the statement of the sociological phase of gospel teaching, are masterly specimens of literature. But just because he says so much that is good, for that very reason is his hidden heresy dangerous. Where Harnack is the devil's bait, we may expect the hook to be attractively covered. For this we may well feel profoundly sorry. What a knightly champion for the truth he could be! But he is found wanting in his conceptions concerning the contents of the Gospels and the Person of Christ. This we will now endeavor to show.

He professes above all things to be a historian. Yet he often

uses the language of a theologian, and toward the end even turns prophet with a tinge of pessimism. But the critic never fails to be uppermost. We insist that a historian must have a free mind; he must not reason *a priori*; must have no preconception or governing theory; he must depend upon induction alone to establish his argument. No one will dispute these requirements. But on this point Harnack fails us. He assumes that miracles are an infraction of the coherence or continuity of nature, and consequently are an impossibility ("Als Durchbrechung des Naturzusammenhangs, keine Wundergeben kann," p. 17). It follows, of course, that he does not allow the miraculous conception and incarnation of Christ. Yet he does not deny that wonders happened. "That the earth in its course ever stood still, that a she-ass spoke, that a sea-storm was stilled by a word, we do not believe and will not again believe; but that the lame walked, the blind saw and the deaf heard, we will not abruptly dismiss as an illusion" (p. 18). Thus by one summary stroke Jesus, Apollonius of Tyana, Mrs. Eddy, and the notorious Dr. Dowie, Elijah III, of Chicago, are placed on the same level, and Dr. Harnack subscribes himself a disciple of Dr. Paulus and Prof. Haeckel, the lowest of the rationalists. Consistent with his predilection is the company he chooses for his journey. The few citations in which he indulges are not usually taken from authors whom the Church delights to quote, but from the writings of such men as John Stuart Mill, Thomas Carlyle, the poet Goethe, Prof. Wellhausen and John Frederick Strauss. With a sigh one asks, "What have these men done for Christianity?"

We cannot here enter upon a discussion of the subject of miracles. But every reader knows what an important part of the gospel-story such occurrences are—not an accidental, but an integral part—so that the New Testament rises or falls with them. Yet this would-be defender of Christianity suavely declares (Saunders's translation, 26), "As an interruption of the order of nature, there can be no such things as miracles." He ascribes them to the realm of phantasia and metaphor. Yet he inconsistently enough says that the decisive question of the Gospel is, "Whether we are helplessly held by an inexorable

necessity, or whether there is a God, who sits in the heavens, and whose power to compel nature we may move by prayer and may experience" (p. 19). Since God is thus confessedly above nature, why should He not be able for sufficient reasons to work miracles in time and space? If there is that which is supernatural, why should it not manifest itself? Harnack recognizes the principle, but denies the phenomenon, except so far as psychic or other occult forces may explain it. In other words, he makes reason alone the arbiter of the case, by denying supernatural activity to God.

However, it is readily acknowledged that these wonders had only a relative value in the mission of Christ. They but legitimate higher things. In this light it is not as remarkable as Harnack thinks it is, that "Jesus himself did not lay the final stress (*das entscheidende Gewicht*) upon his miraculous deeds" (p. 19), which his disciples assigned to them. However, there is one authentic tradition which greatly weakens the above observation. Though the effect and need of miracles primarily were for the pupils and not for the Master, nevertheless the latter, as his message to his anxious forerunner indicates, did not ignore them. "Go your way and tell John the things which ye do hear and see; the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear, *and the dead are raised up*, and the poor have good tidings preached to them" (Matt. 11 : 4-5). Though Harnack says there is nothing more edifying than the Lord's answer to John's touching question, he twice out of three times garbles it by omitting the most critical clause—"and the dead are raised up!!" Why? The non-sequiturs of this devotee of the modern scientific spirit are similarly astonishing. In one bold statement he sometimes draws unwarranted inferences which it would take a whole article to answer and a whole book to render even plausible. In this respect it is as difficult to reply to him as it was for Gladstone to argue with Ingersoll, who, the great statesman said, hurled questions and assertions as fast as a machine-gun fires balls. For instance, Harnack says (p. 20): "Paul also is silent, so that we may be sure that the oldest tradition knew nothing of the stories of the birth of Jesus." How, by one sweep of the

hand, Luke, the careful and conscientious biographer, but above all, the contemporary of Mary, is thus brushed aside! Again how the unsubstantial, bloodless argument from "silence," which never yet did and never will prove anything, is here made to do service as if it possessed any positive force. A man who is driven to such resources must be conscious of having a weak cause and still weaker weapons. But these pretensions to know more and to understand better than the writers of the Bible is symptomatic of the present-day disease of higher criticism.

How can a man consistently demand that others should be scientific and then assume that the incarnation is an impossibility and that the record of it is a myth? When two of the synoptists write the memoirs of the most divine life that earth ever saw or can see, they begin not with inspired Man, but with the Babe, "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." And the whole fourfold Gospel, by the synoptists and John, is in woven harmony with this miraculous birth, the supernatural character of Christ, His claim of pre-existence, and peculiar sonship, His divine teaching, His miracles of love and power, His crucifixion, His resurrection and ascension, and the supernatural power of Christianity. But Harnack wishes to revise the Apostles' Creed! However, if that birth-record is not true, then nothing else in these gospels is reliable; the fact is, then we have no Gospel at all.

Strangely enough our author rejects the Johannine authorship and historical value of the fourth gospel. Yet it contains no birth-legend! But he always waves aside everything that does not coincide with his preconceptions.

Every reader of the four evangelists knows how much Jesus spoke of himself as the Son of God and that the Jews did not so much find fault with his theology and his ethical teachings, as with his high personal claims. But in Harnack's book all this is denied. "The Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it, has to do with the Father only, and not with the Son." How many passages contradict that statement! Yet we are asked to believe the learned lecturer! But though Harnack acknowledges that Jesus claimed divine Sonship in a special sense for himself

alone, his explanation of the manner in which He was the Son of God is that of rationalism. "His consciousness of being the Son of God is nothing else than the practical consequence of his knowledge of God as the Father and his Father. Rightly understood the knowledge of God is the whole content of the name of Son" (p. 81). Here we have a specimen of a school of thought which would have a Christ without a Christology; a gospel, without a doctrine of the Gospel—except that of the higher critic. Thus this professed admirer of Jesus Christ brings his own ideas into the New Testament and explains away most of what the Redeemer of men said concerning himself. No candid seeker of truth ever found such a blurred photogravure of this wondrous man in the Bible. Jesus of Nazareth we know, but Harnack's Jesus is found only on the pages of "*Das Wesen des Christenthums*" and in kindred literature. For if the name of Son of God means no more than the highest knowledge of God, then He has not yet appeared who can say with full meaning, "I and the Father are one," and "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father." Then we may have had among us the most perfect man, but not "God manifest in the flesh," or "the brightness of his glory and the express image of his person." Then Paul was mistaken; and yet Harnack distinctly says that the great apostle "was the one who understood the Master."

Though thrice a voice spoke from heaven telling Christ and us who he was, and his miracles were divine credentials to himself as well as to men, on the question of how he became convinced of his divine mission, our author takes refuge in the mysterious desert of agnosticism—the asylum of cowardice. As to the psychological process by which he came to such a consciousness any believer may well inquire, for that is an unfathomable problem—on the supposition that He was a mere man, reaching the bottom of the abyss with its effrontery. But on the theory that He was a divine being, the fact of his messiahship becomes a part of the simple alphabet of the babes and sucklings of intuitive trust. This facile agnosticism is a modern species of that neurotic cleverness, which passes for

superior erudition. It will not enter a fort which it must defend, but rushes among the sand dunes of Sahara, where the storms which criticism has stirred up obscure the sun with dust-clouds, and cries from out the gloom, "I can not know," and afterwards acts as though it had won a battle. There certainly are things which can not be understood, both because we have not the faculties to grasp them nor the means to get possession of them. But that which has been revealed may also be known—indeed it is our duty to know, and not humility, but perversity, to refuse to know.

If anything in the life of Christ was objective one would think the descent of the dove and the heavenly voice at the Jordan were so. But Harnack says (p. 88): "In an inner event which Jesus experienced at his baptism the oldest tradition saw the foundation of his messianic consciousness." Now Jesus himself never told us one word of that inner experience. Yet our author says it was the oldest tradition. But John Baptist has informed us that he saw, not indeed the subjective, but the objective dove descending upon Him. Who knows best?

But Harnack makes a total wreck of his proud ship when he allows the gales of rationalism to drive it against the rocky tomb of Christ. A sailor may be both bold and rash, without being brave. The learned professor, if he really meant to serve Christianity, had more profitably taken up the time of his students with a course of dissertations on the voyages of Ulysses or Aeneas, or Paul, than to undermine their faith in the reality of its palladium. If the body of Mary's son is a part of Judean dust and still sleeps its long sleep under Syrian skies, then our dear religion may at this moment be the most dynamic in the world, but it can not remain so forever. A dead Jesus can not, and should not, be the accepted Saviour of men.

In the beginning of the "Wesen" Harnack truly says: "It is not a question of a doctrine being handed down by uniform repetition or arbitrarily distorted; it is a question of a life, again and again kindled afresh, and now burning with a flame of its own" (p. 7). Yes, but how can a lively hope be based upon a closed grave? If Jesus Christ has no higher immortality than

the truth He taught and the impress of Himself that He has made upon the human race and which will continue as the race exists, then He is but another Plato with indeed an ideal, yet one which will in time be superseded by a still higher one. Harnack makes a factitious distinction between what he calls the Easter message and the Easter faith, and declares that the New Testament itself distinguishes between them (p. 101). His assertion is false, and by it he places himself on a level with those errorists at Corinth who, considering themselves more illuminated and more spiritual than Paul, denied the resurrection of the dead, averring no doubt that the new birth was it, and hence that it was already past (I Cor. 15 : 12 ; II Tim. 2 : 18). Such splitting of cherry-stones may be both astute and entertaining, but we are not now nor at any other time concerned about the imaginary difference between an Easter message and an Easter faith, but about *the Easter fact*. We want history. Our professor, true to the atmosphere of his chair, early declares that "the chief features of the Gospel are to be corrected by reference to history" (die Grundzüge des Evangeliums, kontrollirte an der Geschichte, p. 10). But just here history corrects her own teacher! He acknowledges that Paul and the early Christians built up the Church on the conviction of the Risen Christ. Thanks for the concession. On what else could they possibly have built it? What other foundation have we to-day? Yet Harnack insidiously leaves us under the impression that the first martyrs were mistaken. With a supercilious wave of the hand and a contemptuous shrug of the shoulders, he pretends to ignore the capstone miracle of the ages, the keystone in which nature and the supernatural meet, the climax of the most wonderful history that ever was lived among men. If on this vital point the testimony of the synoptists (to say nothing of John and Paul) is not taken, then all of Christianity is myth and fiction. Then it has no substance (Wesen) to describe or to defend. "Give me a place on which to stand," demanded ancient philosophy (δός μοι στῆλιν). This solid fact Christianity furnished alone in the resurrection of Christ, and not in the sermon on the Mount. From the law of parsimony we reject Har-

nack's purely ethical argument. The cause must be adequate to the effect, but even the exalted ethics of Christ could not account for the wonderful phenomenon of the religion which bears His name. Nothing but the resurrection of Jesus could account even for the conversion of Paul. But likely our author does not believe that Paul was converted. Of regeneration and other spiritual entities he at least has nothing to say. He lived and moved in legalism. As we walk with him through these pages, we feel that we are promenading in brilliant company along the periphery of his subject, but that we are far, very far, from the center. We have noticed that a shallow lake seems to be very deep when it is murky, and for the same reason great scholarship often appears much profounder than it is.

But we must bring these cursory notes to an end. It is not to be supposed that one could in a magazine article fully answer such a treatise as this "Wesen" is. But as it has made a deep impression in many circles, and waves of it are beginning to be felt in various corners, and as the writer has given it a thorough examination (reading all of it thrice and much of it oftener), with the feeling of a man who expected bread and received a stone, he would briefly recapitulate his objections to it.

1. It is of a piece with the present higher criticism, which from a variety of motives is just now in all ways trying to get the public ear. This already is condemnation enough. Recall what this same method has tried to do with Homer and Shakespeare, Moses and Isaiah. It is destructive of everything, constructive of nothing, and is based upon the evolution theory of the universe which itself never as much as today was so greatly in need of proof.

2. Harnack seeks to establish Christianity in the esteem of men by compromise with its critics. Such an irenicon is to be rejected. It will please the skeptic without winning him. Any signs of surrender will be hailed with delight by those whose opposition is not worthy of any respect. Harnack professes to give up only the husk. But he must be color-blind; for he throws away much of the kernel. But we are weary of this

shell-and-kernel argument. It over-vaults itself and proves too much. Has there ever been a nut without a shell? If the Judiac envelope were all we needed to surrender to unbelief, we could acquiesce. We could throw away the swaddling clothes if we could keep the Babe of Bethlehem. But here is the rub; Harnack has delivered it to the wolves.

3. He is false to the inductive method which he claims to follow. Of science falsely so-called there is much in the world. Let us have induction. Let its principles by all means be applied to the Bible. But every page of "*Das Wesen*" shows that its author deduced his ruling ideas from his own consciousness. As the stream can not rise higher than its source, we have in consequence an abortive Harnackian Christianity, but not that of the New Testament.

4. His spirit is cynical toward the conservatives who will not yield the old positions. It is very noticeable that the only disposition which rationalistic criticism approves is that of abject sycophancy. We are meekly to allow ourselves to be robbed without protest. All defense and especially all attack is considered bad form. We are to remain cool as ice and hard as adamant, while the ark is being carried out of Jerusalem. The critics want a monopoly in sarcasm and dissection. Such articles as the present one are the ebullition of ignorance—unscientific vaporings, because not the incense of adulation. But if a good spirit means submission to intellectual tyranny, an old guardsman does not understand the terms, and certainly he has not been won by the spirit of this book.

5. That he arbitrarily starts out with the assumption that there is nothing supernatural in the life, character, or teachings of Jesus. For this reason he seldom calls him Christ. For the same reason he slights St. John's testimony, ignores the genealogy, the miracles, and the resurrection. To interpret a history which is itself a miracle he scouts at the idea of the possibility of miracles. Is such a historian reliable? The Scriptures are a fabric composed of a divine warp and a human woof. The first and principal one, which connects earth with heaven through the incarnation and ascension of Christ, this

ruthless dissector cuts in two with his critic's knife. What now becomes of the frail web! On what shall it rest?

6. That the testimony of Jesus concerning Himself is to be understood, not on historico-grammatical grounds, according to the plain meaning of language, but in a far-fetched gnosiological sense. In this respect we have Channing again, only the hypothesis is gray with age. It runs thus: Jesus is the best man that ever lived, he taught the truth about everything, except about himself! "It is not as a mere factor," says Harnack, "that he is connected with the Gospel; he was its personal realization and its strength." This is coming near the truth, which is that Christ himself *is* the Gospel. But this is not so to one who accepts only His testimony concerning his Father and not that concerning himself.

7. That Harnack but rejects the Christology of orthodoxy to spin out one of his own. This is an old experiment. He will hear nothing of any doctrine, except that which he himself dictates. Thus in spite of himself the historian has turned theologian (*sutor supra crepidam judicavit*) and on this, to him, strange road we refuse to follow him. Between the *forma doctrinae* of Paul (Rom. 6 : 17) and that of Harnack, we choose to adhere to the former.

8. By holding the moral doctrines, and not the person of Christ, to be the essence of Christianity, Harnack annuls the gospel of salvation by grace on the merits of His perfect life and sacrificial death, vicarious death, and thus establishes the old legalism of salvation by works instead of by faith. He would reenact the law, which man always found it impossible to fulfill and replace upon our backs the burden which never failed to break us down. Surely Judaism and Paganism, as well also Catholicism, owe him thanks for rehabilitating their dead creed. Christ then is only another Moses and the Gospel but a newer, though a better, Deuteronomy.

SHALL WOMEN PREACH?

BY MARGARET R. SEEBACH, A.M.

In the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY for July appears an article entitled *Shall Women Preach in the Congregation? An Exegetical Treatise*, by Professor J. L. Neve, D.D. He states, and undertakes to prove, that Paul's words on the subject establish "a rule not for one congregation only, but for all the assemblies of the saints," and for all times. On the exegetical side of this article Dr. Neve is no doubt orthodox; but his deductions are not all acceptable, and the article as a whole appears to lack the balance of the practical.

He condemns as worthy only of "a champion of modern theology"—which seems to mean one who does *not* consider "that the Holy Scripture is a source and rule for all faith and practice"—a consideration of the teachings of the apostles as in any way modified by the times in which they lived. It is truly unfortunate that the apostles had to live in a particular period of history, and that they refer so often to the customs and peculiarities of their own times. It is somewhat more lamentable that modern ideas are so degenerate. For instance, it would be hard to-day to convince a woman who wanted to preach that the chief objection to her doing so is that "Adam was first formed, then Eve." No! if we are going to keep the "new woman" from preaching, it will be by other arguments than this "ground rule of creation."

Dr. Neve goes even farther than this. He says that if we do not take Paul's dictum on this subject as "true and binding to-day," just as when it was written, "then we are on dangerous ground; then we cannot with Peter say that we have a 'sure word of prophecy.' If we have the right to interpret thus, and so get rid of something that does not suit the taste of our age, what then can we answer if, for instance, a champion of 'free love' attacks the institution of marriage, saying that such requirements of the Bible do not hold for our day?"

It surely seems rather extreme to say that if we do not retain

all the apostolic recommendations in matters of church government, we have no sure basis for moral duties. Even if the questions were of like quality, the roots of inspiration run back far deeper than the epistles of Paul. The commentator is unfortunate in his choice of a parallel. To-day it is not on Paul's views that we rest our theory of marriage, but on the Ten Commandments and the teachings of Christ. Would Dr. Neve refer the ground of Christian marriage to I Cor. 7 : 32-34, or 37-38? Or did Paul write other things beside these "for the present necessity?"

While the historical view is not the only one to take, it is certainly very illuminating in this particular instance. At least, it can do no harm to remember that in Greece, at the time when Paul wrote, lack of education was the mark of a virtuous woman. The only women who would be mentally fitted to teach the Church anything would be morally unfitted. Though they were penitent and cleansed, yet their very brilliancy of intellect would always remind their hearers of what they had been; and their teaching would not be to edification. Probably, however, Paul refers less to preaching as we know it than to the "glossolalia," which he elsewhere discredits as a source of disorder, and which in the case of women was as prone to run into hysterics as the more modern revival methods. The word *λαλεῖν*, which Dr. Neve tries to interpret "preach," makes this more than reasonable.

But if we admit that the particular conditions of the Church are altered, must we say that Paul would have given different counsel to-day? Are there reasons of practical expediency which justify the position of our Church in not accepting women as preachers? Do the education of women and their altered social standing make it unjust to deny them this privilege? There has been much discussion of this question during the last few years, when the papers have been full of notices of pulpits "supplied in the pastor's absence by his wife." An able and spirited plea has come before our own Church in the form of a story from the pen of one who would be herself richly qualified for such service. Meantime our Lutheran women are doing all but preaching, and often, in connection with their missionary

work, addressing audiences larger than many a pastor has before him on Sunday. In these we glory, and even apply to them the words of the conservative Paul in saying "Help those women!" Why, then, do we withhold from them the crowning privilege? Why not educate and ordain them as pastors?

Some may reply that it is on account of prejudice, which must be overcome gradually by individual successes. The woman who supplies her husband's pulpit steps imperceptibly, they may say, into work for which she is fitted and opens a door to her sisters. Of all the proposed methods, this seems to us the worst. It is not entering into the fold by the door, but climbing up another way. If an unordained layman of one sex may do this, why not of the other? Yet who would want to see the significance of ordination and the value of ministerial education thus set aside, and our pulpits supplied by anyone who knows enough to talk for thirty minutes on religious subjects? When we define the place of a woman in the Church, let us never forget that she is a *layman*—pastor's wife or not. It is no more proper and lawful for her to occupy a pulpit on the Sabbath day as a preacher and spiritual guide than to solemnize marriage or baptism. This is said with no intention to exalt the priesthood of the ordained. The universal priesthood of believers is so great and real an honor that no one need envy the ordained minister as nearer to God or more blest by Him. We have self-government in this country, and every citizen can feel himself the equal of a king. Yet all are not magistrates, and it goes ill when those who are not attempt to take the law into their own hands.

Whatever, then, any other laymen may do in the Church, let us grant, if we will, to women. Let them teach in the schools of the Church, let them pray in prayer-meetings, let them conduct mid-week services where it is customary for laymen to do these things. But keep the Sabbath ministrations for those who have received training for this very thing, and whose life-work it is.

Then why not educate women for this work? is the next question we have to meet. The answer is manifold, but it all amounts to this: Because it would involve, on the part of

women, the celibacy of the clergy. Without going into details, it is just as impossible for a woman to combine home duties with the work of a pastor and preacher as with any other business or profession. Were it possible for her to leave her household in the hands of others so as to give her time for a work which is supposed to occupy the whole time of a man who adopts it, she would lose in moral influence by such indifference to home and children. Even if she had no one but her husband to consider, his own profession would be an obstacle. Should she receive a call from another charge, would he be expected to leave his medical practice, his store, his factory, and follow her? Or if he were a preacher, would it frequently happen that they could get adjoining charges? Evidently, marriage would mean, for a woman, retirement from the active ministry.

Some one objects that there are many unmarried women who could do this work. It must be remembered, however, that in order to gain the best results, education for such a sphere should begin at an age considerably earlier than that at which most women can be considered confirmed spinsters. Would it not be necessary, especially in the case of beneficiaries, to exact from those who entered on such a course a promise not to marry for an almost prohibitive number of years? The Deaconess is not a case in point. Her training is not so protracted nor so costly, nor is her specialty useless after marriage, as much of the technical theological training would be to a woman.

But even if we can conceive of a moral, healthful, helpful woman permanently without family ties or the desire for them, there is another and a fundamental reason why women should not be taught and ordained as preachers. The quality of a woman's mind is different from that of a man. This does not mean necessarily that it is inferior. It simply means that things do not appeal to her from the same side, do not appear to her in the same light, as to man. We are not to be startled any more by the saying that reason is the province of the masculine mind, intuition of the feminine. Yet this means that a woman ordinarily cannot convince a man of a thing by argument. In logical presentation of truth, she is usually a failure. Thus arises a serious question: Can a woman's preaching win and

hold men in the Church? And when we consider that the great lack of the Church in all ages has been such a virile and logical interpretation of truth as will appeal to *men*, and hold their allegiance, this question assumes large proportions. The Church *has* the women—has always had them; she needs the men!

Personally, it seems to us that even a limited participation in public speech is a dangerous intoxicant for a woman who has any taste at all for it. A woman can sell her mental and spiritual powers in just as meretricious a desire for admiration and influence as her bodily graces. The aesthetic sense, ever the serpent tempter of woman, would too often gain the ascendancy, and we should have lectures on philosophy, art, literature, but not sermons. The mere topics of most of the reported "sermons by a woman" are significant examples of this. Woman in public life is too new to be trusted with this most subtle of temptations. Her intentions are good, but she does not realize what a powerful stimulant success of this kind would prove to spiritual dilettantism. Then the balance would swing to the opposite extreme, and we should have women preaching reactionary dogmas to an extent that would amount to intolerance. Logic would save a man from this, while feeling would drive a woman into it. The very sensationalism of doing a thing so new would be a positive spiritual injury to a sensitive mind. As long as we see in the newspapers such startling headlines as "A Woman Preacher," "Filled Her Husband's Pulpit," and the like, let us stand by St. Paul. The time is not ripe.

ARTICLE VII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

BY REV. M. COOVER, A.M.

The pursuit of Biblical scholarship has for several decades been predominantly along the lines of historical study. Not infrequently the great objective facts of religion have been minimized, or veiled as to their importance by considerations of their historic evolution, or the philosophy of their bearings. The supernaturalness of Christ's character and works has suffered at the hands of scholars who have found the Nazarine a man merely of superior ethical worth, a man whose ethical keenness and love of righteousness place him on an equality with God. Jesus' superior penetration into divine verities, and his susceptibility to acute moral discernment, are made the measure of his divinity. The quality of such a character constituting a Savior consists in mere ethical influence over men. God simply offers Christ for an example of most beautiful and unlimited devotion to truth. The death of Christ is but the common end of uncompromising truth in conflict with an ignorant and prejudiced world. Professor Denney summons us to view the objective fact and absolute necessity of the death of Christ as a predetermined and vicariously chosen means of deliverance from sin.*

Christ's death was not an experience simply inevitable; it was indispensable for man's salvation.

Dr. Denney does not present a philosophical or ethical treatment of his theme, but arrays with logical power and efficacy the New Testament texts with logical developments of

* *The Death of Christ: Its place and Interpretation in the New Testament.* By James Denney, D.D., Professor of New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow. 8vo. Pp. xix, 334. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price \$1.50.

most applicable cogency. The book is not designed for novel treatment of soteriology. It but places timely stress upon the essentialness of death as plainly taught in New Testament Theology, upon death as a covering for sin by plain exegesis. Professor Denney does not, however, always keep clearly before the mind the forensic character of justification. Too frequently the exegesis in its application to the believer borders on a transfer of moral righteousness, an immediate infusion of sanctified life, to the believer in Christ's atoning death. What Christ was and all that he was is essential for an adequate understanding of what he did; but what he did for us does not infuse in us all that he was. But the treatment is a comprehensive and valuable summary of the New Testament teaching of redemption through the death of Christ, and of the essentialness of his vicarious sacrifice for sin. It is a healthy corrective of the view of Jesus' death as a heroic example, and of the virtue of his death as consisting solely in its ethical value.

After the swing of historical criticism recedes from its ultra-stretch and gains a normal arc the truths of the old and essential facts of the redemptive process will be found the same imperative and indispensable necessities; but with the old verities will be found something additional, not in conflict, but as a recognized concomitant, with the old. Dr. Denney stops with the old and true, that Jesus was born to die. But that is not all of redemption.

There is not only a trinity of persons in the essence of the godhead, but as well a trinity of agents working out the plan of human salvation. Christ lays aside flesh and blood that as Spirit, his *alter ego*, he may return for his work in the spiritual dispensation of grace. Christ bore the sins of the world on to the cross.

Jesus in his physical death died under the burden of the world's weight of sin and wrong. But he did not descend into Hades to suffer the pangs of remorse, or of an evil conscience, or to experience the character of the impenitent and obdurate criminal. In Hades Jesus was victor. Jesus must needs suffer to enter into his glory.

The spiritual principle of the atonement must follow his death to make salvation completely adaptable to man. The grace of God revealed in Jesus Christ is in operation, but is not an operation. It is an attitude, not an energy. Grace is a disposition of the will or heart of God toward the sinner, and is an energy only when acting in an agent. The Holy Spirit is now the agent. The full work of salvation is trinitarian in its operation. Jesus in going away gives opportunity for his indwelling in believers (John 14 : 23).

Through penitence the sinner enters into God's hatred against sin, and through his faith justification, acquittal from sin, is accorded to him. This very faith in Christ by which he is accorded the righteousness of God is the first act of the Holy Spirit in the sinner. Faith is the gift of God borne into the will and heart of the sinner making him a believer. Prevenient grace becomes effective through the third actor of the divine trinity. God creates for the purposes of love; Jesus reveals and suffers for the purposes of love; the Holy Spirit energises this love in man. The third person of the trinity is the executive agent of spiritual salvation in the believer.

Justification is an acquittal from sin. It is a forsenic declaration. It effects a status, not a transfer of the righteousness of God by which the sinner attains immediate moral perfection. Justification is a declaration of exculpation, but following this is a transfer of moral energy which begins the work of righteousness in the believer.

Justification is not an infusion of moral quality, but is conditional on moral incipency, and that incipency of righteousness is faith. Faith is an ethical quality and comes by the Holy Spirit. God justifies when the sinner believes, and to repent and believe embraces hatred of sin and appreciation of God's righteousness as revealed in the justice of God in punishing sin, and in the righteousness of Jesus bearing sin to his death on the cross. The act of faith is of divine origin; its exercise by the sinner is a moral exercise including ethical appreciation of Christ's work, and a denouncement of sin the penalty of which Jesus bore away. Doctrinal development has been wont to stop too soon in the unfolding of the plan of human redemption.

The agent of the application, the Holy Spirit, has been too much slighted. The vagaries of spiritual manifestations and activities now in vogue in some schools are symptoms of struggle toward the light of truth. The third article of the Apostles' Creed yet lacks adequate development. Denominational confessions are now inserting an article on the Holy Spirit to give expression to the essential feature of the historic development of the Christian religion, which so long failed to secure proper countenance. The spiritual principle of the atonement finds expression in the action of a complete trinity of the manifestations of the grace of God. The philosophy of religion cannot rest in a dualism. The efforts of Neo-Hegelianism through its recent English and American disciples grope after an adequate expression of the spiritual principle of life. The light will come and the goal of expression and comprehension will at length be reached by continued struggles in search of truth, by the elimination of the manifestly false and the development of the true. Systematic Theology will share in the fruits which must mature when the blind efforts gradually merge into the illumination of the Spirit. The plaintive dissatisfied appeal of philosophy crying in the night may well hear a response from Biblical truth, and find its light in the permeative energy of the Holy Ghost operating in the life of man.

The historical criticism of the Christian religion which now minimizes the supernatural in Christ, and lays so much stress on the ethical principles of faith and life as sufficient means to effect salvation is awakening in the keenly susceptible and spiritually discerning opponents of a merely ethical Christ the consciousness of an essential divine trinity in the movement of the developed plan of redemption. The sometime prevalent view of salvation which deemed the manifestation of grace complete by the work of Christ on earth, which stopped in its divine display with the death and resurrection of Jesus, ends in a duality, and in a sometime overdrawn lesson of objective vicarious death, and like the Roman Church makes the sign of the cross over everything, the emblem of a dead Christ.

The work of redemption is not a divine dualism; and the new formation of a theological system after its first natura

errors and eccentricities, will not rescind the old, but add to it trinitarian completeness. No less importance must be ascribed to the vicarious work of Christ, nor to the indispensableness of his death as a necessary covering for sin. But of consecutive importance is the dispensation of the Holy Spirit. The communion of the Holy Ghost has been so much classed with mysticism as to suffer from lack of adequate recognition and doctrinal treatment. It is mystical, but yet a fact. It is no more mystical than the Creator's relation to material things, or the union of the human and divine in the person of Jesus Christ.

The Holy Spirit is God in his executive will; and the Spirit's indwelling in man is not a confusion of natures, but a concurrence of the will. The mental struggle to give proper emphasis to man's ethical relation to God has rudely and wrongly set aside the objective facts of the incarnation. But when the truer ethical relation has been more correctly conceived and more adequately stated in its dogmatic position in the development of doctrine, it will be seen as dependent upon, and rightly complementary to, the Church's historic teaching of the incarnation and atonement. The higher ethical conception will see the invalidity of the Ritschlian idea that the scripture teaching may not be true as to objective fact, yet true in the effects wrought in the believer. Such value judgments as deny to biblical events historical truth, and give worth only to moral influences resultant upon reliance on imperfectly conceived facts or events which never had objective reality, lose their ground of validity and can furnish no adequate certitude to the Christian consciousness.

The ultimate ground of certitude is not the believer's own religious consciousness, nor can it be a product of influences resulting from mere facts of invention. The power which saves and then certifies to the religious consciousness the validity of its work must be something more and above that consciousness itself.

If the history of what Christ has done be not a true history, and yet the influences of belief in it beget saved character, then moral character sustains an abnormal relation to truth, or rather

sustains no right relation to objective fact. That the falsity of a fact should be an adequate cause creating sufficient ground for religious certitude is an unethical conception. If knowledge have its ground in ignorance, and righteousness its ultimate origin in sin, then may fiction suffice for Christian certitude. At this stage of the denial of the objective truth in respect of biblical history Dr. Denney's book brings healthy emphasis to correct a prodigal theology.

The naturalistic conception of Christ's personality and works so prevalent in German theology as a result of historical study bears adversely and destructively upon Reformation theology and Lutheran doctrine. The denial of the supernatural or an ethicalizing of its import which empties it of true significance, must soon be seen as a spoliation of the ground of the Lutheran system.

The advocates of a merely ethical soteriology who eliminate the supernatural from the conduct of grace and from the action of the establishment of salvation still claim faith, an adequately justifying faith in Jesus Christ. But what constitutes justifying faith? What kind of faith is that by which justification is secured for the believer? Does faith in Jesus as the sublime ethical teacher, as the fullest embodiment of spiritual manhood, secure justification? Does belief in Jesus as the divine example of devotion to truth, as the incarnation of uncompromizing loyalty to moral principles even unto death, constitute a saving faith? Does faith in Christ as the superior man, the unfathomable man, who became one with God in moral will and purpose, who in a beautifully heroic life maintained and proved the world's confidence in the reality of righteousness, does such a faith in the sublimely good become a means of exculpation for the sinner? Abraham, by faith, when he was called, went out not knowing whither he went. Is this the faith by reason of which God declared him righteous? Sublime trust in God's providential guidance though beautiful and replete with ethical quality is not the measure of justifying faith. God made Abraham the promise of an heir and of an inheritance through his seed. But

Abraham was an hundred years old, and Sarah was barren and past the years of possible parturition. Procreative powers were dead, yet Abraham considered not the age of Sarah, nor staggered at the promise, believing that God was able to perform that which he had promised. Abraham believed in a promise which involved in its fulfilment the action of the supernatural. It was thus that he attained the righteousness which is of faith. It was faith in the supernatural that constituted it a justifying faith. It was life from the dead, says St. Paul, and belief in such a possibility, that furnished the means by which came the righteousness which was imputed to Abraham. The resurrection of Jesus Christ, the predominately supernatural event concluding the mediatorial mission of Christ constitutes for Paul, in respect of life from the deadness of Sarah's womb, not an analogy merely, but a syllogism.

It is faith alone in the supernatural Christ that constitutes a justifying faith. Whatever ethical qualities faith may possess, or however ethically constituted be the Christ in whom such faith be reposed, apart from belief in the supernatural element in Christ's personality and work, there can arise no imputed righteousness which is by faith. Justifying faith is faith in the supernatural.

The great Lutheran teaching based on God's word is despoiled utterly of its content by any theological structure which eliminates the supernatural from the Christian religion. The German *coryphaei* of advanced New Testament criticism who abandon the supernatural, or veil its significance under ascribed ethical qualities sublimely embodied in Jesus, must soon carry their system to its logical conclusion, a conclusion which demolishes the grounds of the true Lutheran system; for if this foundation be destroyed, whence can come the righteousness which is of faith?

II.

GERMAN.

BY PROFESSOR S. GRING HEFELBOWER, A.M.

It may seem strange to American readers that the Babel-Bibel controversy, that started more than one and one half years ago in the theological world of Germany, has lasted so long. But this is accounted for by the sensational method of Delitzsch's presentation (as over against the strictly scientific), by the fact that Emperor William countenanced both the lectures with his presence and caused the first to be repeated in the palace and was active in securing patronage for the second, and by the importance of the subject treated, namely, Israel's dependence on Babylon for much of her primitive religious history and so many of her religious conceptions. Then, too, it is probably true, as Kittel and others have remarked, that the same address would not have stirred up such an excitement either in England or America, because the liberal and anti-christian press is much larger and much more active in Germany than in those countries. It was but natural that the published lectures should call forth a flood of literature both from the conservative and liberal theologians and from the assyriologists. One reply often prepared the way for another, and then Delitzsch's second address came; and thus the discussion was sustained. However, the course of events during the last six months seems to indicate that the discussion has about run its course, and those who are always looking for something new in theological controversy, and the anti-christian press, must seek some other focus point. This apparent pause in discussion led Prof. Kittel of Leipzig (a very conservative higher critic, when measured by modern German standards) to give, in recent numbers of the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, a history of the controversy, noting only the most important publications.

Though the subject has been touched repeatedly in the QUARTERLY, it is now for the first time possible to give a continuous account of the debate; and since it has been such an important event in theological circles in Germany, we feel justified in giving a very full report.

On the thirteenth of January, 1902, Prof. Delitzsch delivered a lecture on "*Babel und Bibel*" in Berlin before the German Oriental Society and in the presence of the Emperor, who caused it to be repeated in the palace three weeks later. At once it became a chief theme for newspaper articles and of gossip in high official circles of the Empire, many members of which are outspoken unbelievers. The address was delivered under the auspices of the Society and was intended to increase public interest in the service that the Germans were rendering science in this particular field. And it was but natural that the public press, ignorant of and, in many instances, hostile to true Christianity, should take this lecture as a theme for comments, in which they glorified the achievements of German scientists, and prophesied great changes in church and schools; even Delitzsch himself did not hesitate to hint plainly that "the new light" would soon shine from pulpit and teachers' desk. Of course the more conservative German scholars replied with great energy.

During February, March and April, of 1902, the discussion was limited almost exclusively to church papers and similar religious journals. But about March Koenig of Bonn (generally counted among the very conservative critics and as an orthodox Lutheran) published a booklet under the suggestive title of *Bible und Babel, A Study in the History of Civilization*. In the discussion that followed, Koenig was compelled to retract some of his statements, but he successfully exposed most of Delitzsch's exaggerations and false statements.

Then about the Middle of the Summer of 1902, Barth and Oettli published addresses that they had delivered, in which they attack *Babel und Bibel*. Barth, ausserordentlicher Prof. of Semitic philology in Berlin, speaking before Jewish hearers on *Babel und isrealitisches Religionswesen*, seems to go even farther than the conservative Koenig in denying intimate relations between Israel and Babylonia. "Assyriologists have repeatedly claimed that there was a likeness of religious institutions between the Israelites and Babylonians, but this likeness has disappeared under more careful examinations; and they have also

repeatedly asserted, in speaking of the parallel accounts of events in the earliest Semitic history, the borrowing from the Babylonian accounts by the Jews, as if there never had been a primitive Semitic period, or as if the Babylonians were the only remaining witnesses of that first Semitic culture." On the basis of such fundamental principles the Sabbath, Jahve, creation and the flood are discussed. From this it is easy to see what his attitude to the assertions of Delitzsch must be.

Oettli, Prof. of theol. in Greifswald (conservative according to German standards), in *Der Kampf um Babel und Bibel*, sees a much greater dependence of Israel on Babylonia for the material of her accounts of creation etc. He claims that traditions from many peoples, in entering into the religious literature of Israel, went through the critical spirit of prophecy. It would be interesting to know how Oettli conceives of Israel's religious knowledge before the prophets.

Fritz Hommel, the assyriologist of Munich University, attacks Delitzsch in *Die altorientalischen Denkmäler und das Alte Testament*. In the opening pages he criticizes modern higher critics of the Pentateuch most severely; however, he admits that unity and the Mosaic authorship are not to be affirmed unconditionally.

Almost the same time, in the Fall of 1902, Budde published *Das Alte Testament und die Ausgrabungen*, and Kittel *Die babylonischen Ausgrabungen und die biblische Urgeschichte*. Budde condemns Delitzsch of setting up his hypotheses on the basis of Winckler's and Hommel's work, and then goes on to a criticism of Winckler's new edition of Schraeder's *Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*. Budde agrees with Kittel in saying that we are now in the midst of an age of Babylonism—a time when specialists trace almost everything back to that ancient civilization of Mesopotamia, of which we know so little, and which, for this very reason, admits of such wild speculation. Though Budde criticizes this tendency very severely in many respects, he believes that it is clear that the account of the deluge was incorporated into the religious history of Israel from Babylon as late as 700 B. C. Kittel, though

he agrees with Delitzsch in some things, is very severe in his criticism of many most important declarations of Delitzsch. However, he leaves the impression, that in many respects he is not as conservative as he is generally reported to be.

About one month after the publication of these two pamphlets, *Im Kampf um Babel und Bibel* appeared from the pen of Jeremias. He attacks Delitzsch, criticizes Koenig in some things, some of which were rather remote from the theme suggested by the title, and defends Winckler, in this going even so far in finding mythological names in the Old Testament as to assert that David and Solomon were possibly only heroes of legend.

This closes the first stage in the controversy.

Delitzsch spent a part of last year in Babylonia, and soon after his return, on January the twelfth, 1903, he delivered his second lecture on *Babel und Bibel*, again in the presence of the Emperor and Empress and highest dignitaries of state and Church, as was advertised in the newspapers and also in the published addresses. In beginning this address, he said that he owed it to the German Oriental Society and to himself because of the attacks that had been made on his first lecture. And then, after devoting a few minutes to the refutation of attacks that had been made, he went into a lengthy discussion of revelation and its relation to bible history; in fact the entire lecture, as reported and published later, seems to have been got up with this in view.

The presence of the Emperor and the high officials of Church and state was at once interpreted as an expression of their tacit approval, for the general character of any address that Delitzsch might deliver could be inferred easily from what he had said the year before. The press took up the matter and published the content of the lecture far and wide, and, according to the attitude of the journal in religious matters, approved or condemned editorially. One anti-church, and perhaps anti-christian, journal went even so far as to compare him with Luther; just as he stood defiantly before empire and Emperor at Worms, the liberator of his people from papal slavery, so Delitzsch appeared

before the Emperor and empire, the liberator of his fellow countrymen from slavery to the bible. Of all the high officials present, the only one that uttered a public protest was Court-preacher Dryander. For six weeks, or until February the twentieth, the Emperor, the official head of the Prussian Church, remained silent, and wrote his now famous letter of protest against Delitzsch's position to Admiral Hollman (see p. 440) only after persistent, and, in some instances, almost threatening, criticism made it necessary for him to speak. However, the letter, though it seemed to satisfy opposition to a great extent, and compelled Delitzsch and the Emperor's friend, Harnack, to make some awkward explanations, is in many respects most unsatisfactory, and Kittel regards it as an "unparalleled advertisement" of Delitzsch's lecture.

Kittel also sees in the great injury that has been done the Church by the silence of those in high places, a great weakness of the state Church, and many others heartily agree with him. Some claim that this shows conclusively that the time for the dissolution of Church and state is at hand.

The Hilprecht incident, referred to in the last *QUARTERLY* (p. 342), occurred at the time Delitzsch delivered his second lecture.

At first the storm of criticism, which followed immediately, was based exclusively on newspaper reports, for Delitzsch did not publish his address until after the middle of February, and then not as it was delivered, but toned down, probably censored by some higher official or officials in Church or state. However, during the latter part of January he published annotations to his first lecture, in which he replied, sometimes rather sharply, to his chief critics. But even this was toned down in several instances in the later editions.

The conservative religious journals (and there are not very many others in Germany) were prompt in expressing their criticisms, and the anti-christian press made capital out of the fact that Delitzsch had spoken before high church officials and received no official rebuke for so long a time. The general

consensus of opinion is that great injury has been done to the Church by those in high places.

There were also a number of pamphlets published in reply, and many who had criticized the first lecture simply issued new editions of their booklets; Koenig, 8th. and 9th. ed; Oettli, 4th. ed; Kittel, 4th. ed; Jeremias, 4th. ed; Hommel, 2nd. ed; and Budde 2nd. ed. About the middle of March Kittel published his *Der Babel-Bibel-Streit und die Offenbarungsfrage*. Though not specifically a reply to Delitzsch, Rothstein's *Geschichte und Offenbarung mit Bezug auf Israel's Religion* treats the same problem and flatly contradicts Delitzsch's position. Lasson published a pamphlet on *Offenbarung und Ausgrabungen*, in which he claims that archaeological finds have nothing whatever to do with religion, and that Israel's great advantage lay in the fact that God's name was revealed there. Volck makes a valuable contribution to the literature of the controversy in *Zum Kampf um Babel und Bibel*. Other important publications are as follows: Loehr, *Babel und die biblische Urgeschichte*; Giesebrecht, *Friede fuer Babel und Bibel*; Koeberle, *Babylonische Kultur und biblische Religion*; and Gunkel, *Israel und Babylonien* (very liberal).

The discussion, especially in its second stage, where it concerns revelation, touches the field of dogmatic theology, hence we hear from Thieme (Prof. of dog. theol. in Leipzig) concerning *Der Offenbarungsglaube im Streit ueber Babel und Bibel*. It is plain that the controversy has opened up problems that reach far beyond the field of Old Testament theology.

The result of the debate, up to the present, is, according to Kittel, much harm and some good to the Church, and an increased interest in this field of science. When the relation of parts of religious history to Babylonian civilization was the burning question of the day, there was offered to Christian Germany, especially to the highest church officials, a great opportunity to strengthen the cause of evangelical Christianity, by taking a firm and unequivocal stand against error, which to a very great extent, was allowed to pass unimproved. The Em-

peror and certain other church officials are guilty of gross neglect.

Kittel thinks that a great deal has been won in bringing to light two facts; first, that as one man all theologians that wrote against Delitzsch raised a protest against the attempt to separate attacks on the Old Testament from attacks on revelation. The two themes belong together. "They recognized at once the fact that if we are to hold fast at all to faith in God, revelation must be assumed as God's confirmation." Second, the fact that even the most conservative defenders of the Old Testament did not even hint at verbal inspiration, which had been charged repeatedly by Delitzsch and his friends.

In speaking of the tasks before the Church in Germany, which this discussion brought to light, Kittel remarks that Germany is, in many respects, not a bible land, as England and America; the Bible lovers are too exclusive, they must stand on more intimate terms with biblical science of to-day. He seems to think that the popularization of the sure results of biblical science would make the intelligent layman ready to meet all such attacks as this one by Delitzsch—biblical science to Kittel is a rather conservative type of modern higher criticism.

Though the Babel-Bible controversy has abated, only time can tell whether it will remain thus, for the two parties seem to be as pronounced in their convictions as ever. The same theme is bound to reappear from time to time, whether under another form or not, will be determined, in all probability, by the next focus points in theological discussion. Liberal theology does not change rapidly, it merely shifts its basis of attack,

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, PHILADELPHIA.

Biblical Criticism. By John A. W. Haas, D.D., Pastor of St. Paul's Lutheran Church, New York City; author of *Bible Literature*, *Annotations on Mark, &c., &c.*, with an Introduction by Henry E. Jacobs, D.D., LL.D. Pp. xxxi and 223. Price \$1.50.

Biblical Criticism, as carried on by the destructive critics, has gone mad. Its chief purpose at this day seems to be to discover how much of myth and legend and error can be read into the Bible. The result is what might have been expected. A few grains of wheat remain, while all the rest is chaff. And the remarkable thing, that which passes comprehension, is, that in the face of the alleged pious frauds, unauthorized interpretations, falsehoods and hopeless contradictions which the Bible contains, the claim is still put forth that the book is to be accepted and venerated as God's Word. This can be said: the influence which the critical theory may have excited in the past is on the wane and its advocates, by their disagreements and contradictions of each others' conclusions, are rapidly discrediting themselves. Happily for us, our Lutheran Church in America has been but little affected by these discussions. No inroads have been made upon her faith in God's Word. She has remained steadfast in her loyalty and devotion to the Book of Books. The work that lies before us is only another proof of this statement. We welcome it as we welcome and give ear to any voice that is lifted up in defense of the truth.

Our author is familiar with his subject. He has gone up and down through the length of it and is acquainted with all its intricacies and complications. The chapters on the Literary Argument and the Historical Proof are well written, and present in a very clear manner the defects in the conclusions based on style, vocabulary, &c. In the Appendix the author enumerates very fully the list of works on both sides of the question, with a brief comment on each one, thus giving the reader at a glance a knowledge of their contents. We cordially commend this book and are sure that it is a valuable contribution to Biblical Criticism. The Introduction, from the gifted pen of Dr. Jacobs, is itself worth the price of the book.

T. C. BILLHEIMER.

THE MACMILLAN CO.

The Quest of Happiness. By Newell Dwight Hillis.

This book, as indicated by a sub-title which appears on the first page, is a study of victory over life's troubles. It contains seventeen chapters. Each of these chapters is introduced by a "Foreword," which tells in serial form the story of the life of *King Comfortas*, thus illustrating the truths which the author teaches.

We can do nothing better to afford the reader a knowledge of the book and its contents than to give extracts from these captions: "Happiness in its relation to man's growth, success and usefulness; The education of Comfortas"; "That happiness is latent in every form of trouble; The story of the Angel of Sorrow who crowned Comfortas King"; "Happiness through the pursuit of money, with an inquiry why some are unhappy despite their gold, offices and honors; Foreword: The story of a man who coined his wife into money"; "Happiness through conversation and the cultivation of the social life; Foreword: The story of the man with the biting tongue."

Thus the story and the argument run on through seventeen chapters and five hundred and fifteen pages. It is five hundred and fifteen pages of good literature, well printed, with marginal illustrations and artistic binding. Advisedly we say that it is good literature, one might almost say fine writing, of the sort that falls from the pen of a preacher when he habitually writes what it will take him just thirty or forty minutes to repeat to a popular congregation for whom he must not think too fast nor too slow. The author has his thesis and he has thought well upon it, treating it at length and in detail. One's fancy that he has read much upon the subject is supported by a full list of "authorities" sustaining his work on the various chapters. One has guessed this list of authorities all through the book, and at the close, Lo, here it is! And then we are seized with the feeling that when a man speaks of the ways of human happiness, he should have lived in to its truth and should convince his reader of every word by reason of his own strength of utterance. He should utter himself, not studied sentiments. But in following Mr. Hillis through his "Quest," we meet too many of our own old friends of the library. We feel that we are in the company of a good observer, and that he is talking all the while of the other man. We long, then, to hear something of the intrepid person who drives the big white horses on to New York ferryboats, while he sits aloft on a mountain of "goods" and cracks a resounding whip. We should like to hear how this man and his fellows pursue their quest; but we hear more about Socrates, Sir Galahad, or Dante and Petrarch. To be sure the author does touch the third estate; but largely after they have distinguished themselves.

For ourselves, we would have the book shorter, and it may be its length that causes one to feel that its contents have not boiled in the

writer's blood and brewed in his brain, that it lacks the personal element, that it has not been lived and wrung out of anyone, that there is in it nothing of the conqueror, nothing of the one who has wrestled with his angel through the long, dark night of distress and despair and won the blessing. It is the work of the thinking scholar, and as such, we commend it. It is an excellent book to read in single chapters; yet we have closed it with the questions: When will our great preachers quit dreaming of their work, and work? When will they stoop among the actual roots and sources of human living and cease to teach from books, and the knowledge born of books? Where is the Great Prophet of twentieth century America? He ought to appear in Greater New York; but he is yet to come.

M. E. RICHARD.

GERMAN LUTHERAN BOARD, BURLINGTON, IOWA.

The First Page of the Bible. By Fr. Bettex. Translated from the German by W. R.

This little book of seventy-one pages is a gem of its kind. As a popular and devotional exposition of the first chapter of Genesis we commend it to every reader of THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY. Its aim is to show that the Mosaic account of creation is rational, and accords with the demands of physical science. The preacher will find in it excellent homiletical material.

J. W. RICHARD.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON.

The October number of the *Atlantic Monthly* is an unusually fine one. All readers of choice literature will prize it. S. W. McCall contributes the opening paper, "The Power of the Senate." The papers of special interest are those on "Quixotism;" "The Fruits of Industrial Training;" "Some Remarks on the Study of English Verse;" "Of Walks and Walking Tours;" a splendid one on "College Rank and Distinction in Life;" "Some Early impressions;" "Henry Ward Beecher" and "Pius X and his Task." The stories are strong and have the mark of originality in plot and construction which belongs to the fiction of the *Atlantic*. Three unusual poems, full of beauty, are found in this number and the Contributors' Club has four brilliant contributions. The book reviews of this number are particularly valuable.

ct.

le-
e is
led
air
as
ap-
eat
ey
ase
the
in

the

s a
we
n is
rds
it

fine
on-
ers
us-
e;"
ank
ard
ave
the
are
on-
ble.